(25,646)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1916.

No. 816.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX OF A. W. ANDREWS, DECEASED, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

IN ERROR TO THE ROANOKE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

INDEX.

	Page
Exhibit—Record before supreme court of appeals of Virginia	1
Petition	1
Transcript of record from the circuit court of Montgomery county	33
Declaration	33
Bill of exceptions No. 1	42
Testimony of Jerre Walton	43
F. A. Richardson	70
Mrs. Maude L. Andrews	79
Arthur Scrivenor	84
L. S. Randolph	112
Jerre Walton (recalled)	154
G. W. Mitchell	154
J. F. Smith	156
B. O. Yearwood	157
J. C. Shinn	172
R. L. Bowden	177

JUDD & DETWEILER (INC.), PRINTERS, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25, 1917.

	Page
John Schaefer	207
James Reed	209
A. M. McGhee	217
A. S. Funk	220
W. J. Pharr	225
W. R. Moore	228
J. A. Whitesell	229
H. T. Neece	236
W. J. Pharr (recalled)	249
R. H. Scott	250
H. L. Thomas	260
R. H. Scott (recalled)	296
C. L. Richardson	272
A. G. Houston	288
E. C. Grissom	293
C. L. Richardson (recalled)	294
R. F. Scott (recalled)	296
S. H. Lewis	298
R. L. Bowden (recalled)	318
H. T. Neece (recalled)	319
F. T. Slayton	321
N. W. Sample	389
Robert M. Williams	412
F. P. Pfahler	427
S. H. Lewis (recalled)	437
John Doarnberger	439
F. T. Slayton (recalled)	479
A. Kearney	482
J. R. Hubble	504
J. E. Kirk	505
F. T. Slayton (recalled)	515
John Doarnberger (recalled)	515
L. S. Randolph	519
Verdict	536
Motion for new trial, &c	537
Judge's certificate to bill of exceptions No. 1	537
Bill of exceptions No. 2	537
Instructions by court	537
Defendant's instructions	540
Judge's certificate	542
Bill of exceptions No. 3	543
Testimony of Jerry Walton	543
Judge's certificate	543
Bill of exceptions No. 4	544
Testimony of F. A. Richardson	544
Judge's certificate	544
Bill of exceptions No. 5	544
Testimony of Arthur Scrivenor	544
Judge's certificate	550
Bill of exceptions No. 6	550
Testimony of Arthur Scrivenor	550
Judge's certificate	551

Page

Bill of exceptions No. 7 551
Testimony of Arthur Scrivenor 551
Judge's certificate 552
Bill of exceptions No. 8 552
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 552
Judge's certificate 552
Bill of exceptions No. 9 552
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 552
Judge's certificate 553
Bill of exceptions No. 10 553
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 553
Judge's certificate 554
Bill of exceptions No. 11 554
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 554
Judge's certificate 555
Bill of exceptions No. 12 555
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 555
Judge's certificate 556
Bill of exceptions No. 13 556
Testimony of G. W. Mitchell 556
Judge's certificate 556
Bill of exceptions No. 14 556
Testimony of A. H. McGhee 557
Judge's certificate 557
Bill of exceptions No. 15 558
Testimony of H. L. Thomas 558
Judge's certificate 558
Bill of exceptions No. 16 558
Testimony of N. W. Sample 558
Judge's certificate 559
Bill of exceptions No. 17 559
Testimony of John Doarnberger 559
Judge's certificate 560
Bill of exceptions No. 18 560
Testimony of F. T. Slayton 560
Judge's certificate 560
Bill of exceptions No. 19 561
Testimony of L. S. Randolph 561
Judge's certificate 561
Bill of exceptions No. 20 561
Testimony of C. M. Butler 562
W. R. Moore 569
C. M. Butler (recalled) 570
Judge's certificate 571
Agreed order as to pleadings, &c 571
Plea, &c 572
Order of trial, &c 572
Judgment 573
Judge's certificate signing bills of exceptions 1 to 20 .. 575
Clerk's certificate 576
Clerk's certificate to exhibit record 577
Clerk's return to writ of error 577

	Page
Judgment of supreme court of appeals	577
Opinion of court of appeals, January 13, 1916	578
Order of Montgomery circuit court granting leave to amend declaration	583
Amendments to declaration in Montgomery circuit court	584
Order removing case into circuit court of Roanoke county	589
Demurrer to evidence	590
Joinder in demurrer to evidence	591
Bill of exceptions No. 1	592
Testimony of L. S. Randolph	592
Judge's certificate	593
Bill of exceptions No. 2	593
Testimony of L. S. Randolph	593
Judge's certificate	594
Bill of exceptions No. 3	594
Testimony of Arthur Scrivenor	594
Judge's certificate	597
Bill of exceptions No. 4	598
Testimony of L. S. Randolph	598
Judge's certificate	598
Bill of exceptions No. 5	598
Testimony of A. H. McGhee	598
Judge's certificate	599
Judge's certificate to evidence offered but not admitted	599
Testimony of Jerre Walton	600
Arthur Scrivenor	601
L. S. Randolph	601
Judgment	603
Opinion, Moffett, J.	604
Petition for a writ of error	604
Order allowing writ of error	606
Exhibit A to petition—Order of supreme court of appeals refusing writ of error, &c.	606
Assignments of error	606
Bond on writ of error	608
Certificate of lodgment	609
Citation and service	609
Writ of error	610
Certificate to record	611

IN THE

Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia

AT WYTHEVILLE.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY

v.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX.

PETITION.

To the Honorable Judges of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia.

Your petitioner, The Virginian Railway Company, respectfully represents that it is aggrieved by a judgment entered by the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Virginia, on the 12th day of October, 1914, in an action at law therein pending, wherein Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, was plaintiff, and your petitioner was defendant. A transcript of the record of the proceedings in said Circuit Court is herewith presented.

STATEMENT.

The plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was a locomotive engineer, employed by your petitioner. He was engaged in operating an engine on your petitioner's line between Roanoke, Virginia, and Princeton, West Virginia, on the 14th of November, 1912. While said Andrews was running one of your petitioner's engines on a trip from Roanoke to Princeton, the crown-sheet of the engine was blown down and he received injuries from which he afterwards died. The accident occurred about 18 miles out of Roanoke and within an hour and a half after the train being pulled by the engine which exploded had left Roanoke. The plaintiff in her declaration alleged that the defendant was guilty of negligence in the following respects:

(1) That the stay-bolts supporting the crown-sheet were made

of defective material, by faulty workmanship and had been weakened and rendered unsafe by having previously been burned;

(2) That the injectors which supplied water to the boiler were defective and out of order;

(3) That the glass water-guage was out of repair and in an unsafe condition, the valves thereon being stopped up with lime, trash or other deposits so that it improperly registered the quantity of water in the boiler;

(4) That the fire-box of said engine was not made sufficiently strong to withstand the force of an explosion caused by the giving away of the crown-sheet.

A demurrer was sustained to the fourth ground of negligence charged and the Court instructed the jury, without objection on the part of the plaintiff, that the evidence was insufficient to sustain the second ground of negligence charged. The case was therefore submitted to the jury on the first and third grounds of negligence alleged in the plaintiff's declaration. Your petitioner defended the case on the theory that the accident was caused by Engineer Andrews allowing water to become so low in his boiler that the crown-sheet was heated, by not having any water on top of it, to such an extent as to soften the material of which the crown-sheet and the stay-bolts supporting it were made and that they were thereby so weakened that they could not withstand the steam pressure in the boiler. The evidence showed that this engine was constructed by the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the largest and one of the best, if not the best, locomotive builders in the world. The engine was practically new, having been put in service in May or June, 1912. In the construction of this engine extreme care was used in the selection of the material and in the inspection of the work thereon. The specifications were such that the crown-sheet of the engine would have a factor of safety of 13.3 for a steam pressure of 200 pounds. The engine was being operated with a steam pressure of 185 pounds and was therefore able to withstand a pressure of about sixteen times the pressure of the steam at the time of the accident. In order to see that the specifications were complied with and that proper materials were used in the construction of this engine, your petitioner sent inspectors to the Baldwin Locomotive Works to test the material and look after the construction of the engine, who remained there until the engine was completed. The materials of which the crown-sheet and stay-bolts

were made were tested before they were put into the engine and found to be of the required tensil strength. After the completion of the engine, the boiler was tested with both a water and a steam test and was found to be satisfactory. After this explosion occurred, some of the stay-bolt material that was in this engine was taken to the Baldwin Locomotive Works and there tested and found to be of the required strength. The engine had been run by Engineer Andrews practically all the time since it had been put in service. On November 11, 1912, three days prior to the accident, the engine was inspected as required under the Federal Boiler Inspection Act. This inspection showed that the engine and all of its appliances were in perfect condition. The engine was not operated by anyone except Engineer Andrews from that time until the explosion occurred. He had made with it one trip from Princeton to Roanoke and return and then had run the engine back to Roanoke and was making the return trip to Princeton when the boiler exploded. After the explosion, the engine was hauled to Princeton by another engine. The cab of it was boxed up so no one could interfere with it or any of its appliances until the inspectors sent out by the Interstate Commerce Commission in cases of explosion, had arrived to make their inspection. On the 16th and 17th of November, two inspectors sent out by the Interstate Commerce Commission made a thorough inspection of this engine and pronounced the condition of the boiler and all of its appliances to be perfect. Both of said inspectors testified in this case that the engine aside from the injury caused by the explosion was in perfect condition and that the explosion in their judgment was unquestionably due to low water in the engine at the time the explosion occurred. In addition to the inspection made by the government inspectors, a number of other people with wide experience in the inspection of crown-sheets blown down on account of low water inspected the boiler, and all of them reached the conclusion that the explosion unquestionably occurred from low water in the boiler. The witnesses for both the plaintiff and your petitioner, all stated that the crown-sheet which was produced in evidence showed that it had been burned; that is, heated under pressure with no water on top of it; and that the burned area was from 3½ to 4 feet wide and from 4 to 5 feet in length. This burned area was shown by the pockets or convolutions between the stay-bolts supporting the crown-sheet. The stay-bolts were located four inches apart from center to center. The crown-sheet had bags or pockets in it between the stay-bolts which amounted to as much as ⅛ to ¼ of an inch. The plaintiff's expert witnesses testified that the color of the crown-sheet indicated that it

had been burned prior to the time of failure and that it had water on it at the time it actually failed. They were unable to say how long prior to the failure this burning occurred and said that it might have occurred a half hour before the failure or that it might have occurred at some previous time.

To prove her case, the plaintiff relied mainly on two expert witnesses and the fireman who was firing the engine at the time of the accident. The expert witnesses were one L. S. Randolph, who is professor of mechanical engineering at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, and one Arthur Scrivener, who claims to be a power plant engineer and who claims to have had some experience with stationary boilers, but was shown to have had practically no experience with locomotive boilers. These two expert engineers advanced many theories as to how an explosion of this kind might have happened, which will be discussed at length in another connection, and the only expert opinions they gave that in any way tend to support the plaintiff's theory in this case is that the color and appearance of the crown-sheet at the time of the trial indicated that the burning occurred prior to the explosion and that the crown-sheet had water on top of it when it failed. The fireman, Jerry Walton, testified that the water-glass indicated that the engine had water in it at Singer, a point about two and a half miles east of where the accident occurred; that the right injector was working continuously from the time they left Roanoke, and that ordinarily one injector is sufficient to keep the boiler supplied with water. He further testified that he did not see the crown-sheet red hot at any time on that trip and that he did not notice any difference in the light in the fire-box. His testimony on cross-examination showed that he could not see the crown-sheet in firing the engine and that he did not in fact see the crown-sheet from the time the train left Roanoke.

This suit was brought under the Federal Employers' Liability Act and was based on the Act of Congress of February 17, 1911, requiring railroads to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto. The trial resulted in a verdict and judgment in favor of the plaintiff for $20,000.00.

ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR.

Your petitioner assigns the following errors:

(1) The court erred in overruling your petitioner's motion to

set aside the verdict as contrary to the law and the evidence.

(2) The court erred in giving instructions offered by the plaintiff.

(3) The court erred in refusing to give instructions offered by your petitioner.

(4) The court erred in admitting improper evidence offered by the plaintiff.

(5) The court erred in excluding proper evidence offered by your petitioner.

(6) The court erred in refusing to set aside the verdict on the ground that the damages allowed were excessive.

(7) The court below had no jurisdiction to try this case on the ground that a trial by a jury of seven is not the kind of trial provided for under the Employers' Liability Act, being in violation of the seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution.

These assignments of error will be considered in the order above set out.

I. The court should have set aside the verdict as being contrary to the law and the evidence on the ground that there was not sufficient evidence to support a verdict in favor of the plaintiff.

This action, as above stated, was brought under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. The act was not intended to affect existing rules as to negligence, the proximate cause of the accident or the causal relation that must exist between the negligent act and the injury complained of. It was only intended to abolish and modify certain grounds of defense in negligence cases. The fellow servant doctrine is abolished; the rule as to contributory negligence is modified in that it is abolished where a statute for the safety of employees is violated, and in other cases the rule of comparative negligence is introduced. The doctrine of the assumption of risks is abolished where a statute for the safety of employees has been violated.

Seabord Air Line v. Horton, 233 U. S. 492-58 L. Ed. 1062.

Mondou v. New York, etc., Rwy. Co., 223 U. S. 156 L. Ed. 327-346.

The act requiring railroad companies to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances does not change the

burden of proof as to the particular defect alleged to have caused the accident. Under this act the railroad companies are made responsible where a defect is shown to exist, from which an accident resulted, and the liability is absolute in that the railroad company cannot show that due diligence was exercised in order to discover the defect.

This act does not relieve the plaintiff from showing the existence of the defect from which an absolute inference of negligence arises as above stated, but the burden is on the plaintiff to show by sufficient and satisfactory evidence the existence of the defect. The court below recognized this principle in its instructions to the jury, but allowed the plaintiff, instead of proving negligence, to embark in a field of speculation as to how the accident might have been caused otherwise than by an explosion from low water as claimed by the defendant. In other words, the plaintiff, in introducing her evidence, and the court in permitting evidence to be introduced over the objection of the defendant, proceeded on the theory that the burden was on the defendant to explain how and why the explosion occurred instead of being on the plaintiff to show some fact or facts from which it could be determined how and why the crown sheet failed.

The principle is that the plaintiff must show affirmatively the negligence relied upon, and applying this principle to the case in hand, the burden was on the plaintiff to show affirmatively the defects which existed in the boiler and caused the explosion. In order to carry this burden, the plaintiff must produce reliable and substantial evidence tending to show the alleged defects. The principle is nowhere better settled than in Virginia that the existence of negligence cannot be left entirely to conjecture, and that pure speculation as to the causes of an accident does not meet the requirements as to proof of negligence.

N. & W. Rwy. Co. v. Cromer, 101 Va. 667-671.
Consumers Brewing Co. v. Doyle, 102 Va. 399-402.
Northington v. Norfolk Rwy. Co., 102 Va. 446.
N. & W. Rwy. Co. v. McDonald, 160 Va. 207-212.
Baugher v. Harman, 110 Va. 316-319.
Steele v. Colonial Coal Co., 115 Va. 385-388.

Tested by these principles, the plaintiff's evidence utterly fails to establish the existence of the alleged defects in the boiler and the consequent negligence of the defendant.

The case was submitted to the jury on two theories as to the defendant's negligence. One was that the crown-sheet failed on account

of defective materials or improper workmanship, or had been previously burned in service. The other was that the water glass guage was out of order and erroneously indicated the quantity of water in the boiler. It will be observed that these theories are directly opposed to each other, one being based on the idea that the crown-sheet failed on account of defects therein when it was covered with water, and the other being based on the idea that Engineer Andrews was misled by the false indication of water shown by the water glass, and allowed the crown-sheet to become uncovered and to be burned by reason of the defect in the water glass.

If the evidence was sufficient to support either one of these theories, it would absolutely refute the other. The evidence as to both is purely speculative, and the fact that two opposing theories of this kind were relied on shows conclusively that there was no certain and reliable evidence as to the existence of the facts upon which either theory was based. The reliance upon these two theories makes it absolutely uncertain and purely conjectural as to what caused the explosion.

To support the first theory that the explosion occurred on account of defects in the crown-sheet or stay-bolts, the plaintiff relied on the following facts:

The fireman, Jerry Walton, testified that the water glass guage showed water in the boiler from the time the engine left Roanoke until it arrived at Singer, a distance of two and a half miles east of the point where the accident occurred; that he did not look at the water glass again between Singer and the point where the explosion occurred. He also testified that the right injector was working from the time they left Roanoke until the explosion occurred; that one injector will supply a sufficient quantity of water to the boiler, and that he could tell from the sound of the injector that water was being thrown into the boiler. These engines are equipped with two injectors for forcing water from the tank into the boiler, one injector being located on the right side of the cab and one on the left side of the cab, both injectors being located outside of and under the cab, and the pipes leading therefrom into the boilers being entirely outside of the cab. This witness further testified that in firing the engine he did not see the crown-sheet red hot at any time and did not notice any difference in the glow or light in the fire box.

The witness, Arthur Scrivenor, testified that the appearance of the crown-sheet which was produced at the trial did not necessarily

show that it failed from low water, and that from its appearance the explosion might have been caused by low water or from other causes. He also testified that the crown sheet did not appear to have been heated white hot, and that if it had been heated only to a dull red heat, that first-class stay-bolts at that heat should have been able to withstand the boiler pressure. He said that he had had no practical experience in regard to such matters, and that his opinion was based on figures which he had obtained from Kent and other technical books.

The witness, Randolph, said that he saw no indication that the sheet went down with an absence of water from the top of it. He did not think from the appearance of the sheet that it was heated at the time of the explosion beyond a dark red heat, and that good bolts should stand the pressure of the steam in the boiler when heated to a dark or bright red heat. This witness expressed the opinion that the crown-sheet had water on it at the time of failure and said that the color of the sheet was the principal, if not the only, reason he had for saying that the sheet had water on it when it failed. He testified that the sheet had been burned; that is, heated under pressure with no water on it, over an area of 3¼ to 3½ feet wide, and about 4½ feet long. He could not say when it had been burned, and said that the burning may have occurred one-half or three-quarters of an hour before the failure, or at any time previous to that time.

If every fact testified to by these witnesses is treated as being established, such facts absolutely fail to show what caused the explosion. If Jerry Walton, the fireman, observed the water glass guage closely enough to be able to say that the boiler had water in it and over the crown-sheet from the time it left Roanoke until it reached Singer, he did not look at it after passing that point; and it was shown by the evidence of an engineer who ha' several times tried the experiment with this class of engine that as much water as Jerry Walton said was in the boiler at Singer could be exhausted before reaching the point of the accident.

It was also shown by every experienced engineer who testified in the case that although the injector may be working it may not be supplying any water, or a sufficient quantity of water to the boiler. If the valves admitting water and steam to the injector are not properly adjusted, the water will go out through the waste pipe and will not be forced into the boiler. The fact that Jerry Walton did not see the crown-sheet red hot or did not notice any difference in the light in the fire box, does not show that the crown-sheet was not

burned on that trip. If he could have seen the crown-sheet in firing the engine, he does not claim to have been firing the engine constantly from the time it left Roanoke, and the crown-sheet could have been burned at a time when he was not firing the engine. His own evidence, however, shows conclusively that he did not see the crown-sheet, or make any effort to see it on that trip.

The opinions of Scrivenor and Randolph as to what strain the stay-bolts would stand if heated to a certain temperature throws no light on the cause of the explosion, because, according to the testimony of Randolph, the color of the sheet indicated the degree of heat at the time of failure, and if the sheet had previously been heated to a higher temperature and the sheet had then been covered with water and the engine operated, the color of the sheet caused by this higher temperature would have been obliterated by covering the sheet with water and operating the engine. Under this theory as to the color of the sheet, it might have been burned by Engineer Andrews on this trip any time previous to half an hours before the time of the explosion, and so weakened or injured that it failed with water on top of it at the time of the explosion.

It is entirely consistent with the facts testified to by these witnesses that Engineer Andrews may have burned the crown-sheet of this engine at some time after he left Roanoke with it, and in this way caused the explosion which resulted in his death. It certainly does not appear from the facts proved by these witnesses that the crown-sheet failed on account of defects in the engine or appliances for which the defendant is responsible. The evidence utterly fails to show any fact or facts from which it can be determined how and why the explosion occurred.

To support the theory that there was a defect in the water glass guage, and that Engineer Andrews was misled by the water glass guage into allowing the crown-sheet of his engine to become uncovered and burned, the plaintiff relied upon the evidence of Jerry Walton to the effect that the water glass guage indicated a sufficient quantity of water in the boiler from Roanoke to Singer, and upon the evidence of Randolph to the effect that if the water glass guage had been all right when Andrews took charge of the engine at Roanoke, that it could not have become stopped up by deposits of lime and salts between that time and the time of the explosion.

The testimony of all the witnesses was to the effect that an engineer can tell whether his water glass guage is stopped up or not by

the movement of the water in the water glass guage. It was the duty of Engineer Andrews, under the rules of the Company, to inspect his water glass guage before leaving Roanoke. If it was stopped up when he took charge of the engine, or became stopped up at any time on the trip by other means than the deposit of lime and salts, he had the means at hand of removing the obstructions by blowing it out, as the testimony shows can be readily done. In addition to this, the engine was equipped with guage cocks, which all of the witnesses testify afford the most certain and satisfactory means of testing the quantity of water in the boiler. The engine was entirely safe to operate and could have been operated indefinitely without a water glass guage by using the guage cocks.

The plaintiff's evidence not only fails to show any defect in the water glass guage, but on the contrary shows that if there was a defect in the water glass guage that Andrews was responsible for it, and responsible for relying on the water glass guage in a defective condition.

To meet the plaintiff's theory that the engine failed on account of defects in the crown-sheet or stay-bolts, the defendant showed that the engine was constructed according to the latest and most approved plans of boiler construction by locomotive builders of the highest reputation; that the crown-sheet was designed to stand a pressure of about sixteen times as great as the pressure exerted on it at the time of the failure; that it was constructed according to the specifications; that the materials used in its construction were the best obtainable, and that great care was used in the selection of the materials and the construction of the engine. Before the engine was put in service its boiler was thoroughly tested by steam pressure and by water pressure considerably higher than the pressure under which the crown-sheet failed. The engine had only been in service about five months, during which time it was in charge of Engineer Andrews except when he laid off for sickness or other causes. Three days prior to the accident, the monthly inspection required by the Federal Boiler Inspection Act was made of the boiler and all of its appliances, and they were found to be in perfect condition. After this inspection, the engine was handled exclusively by Engineer Andrews, and under the rules of the Company he was required to inspect it at the beginning and at the end of each trip and see that it was in good condition, and no other person was charged with the duty of making such inspection.

Just before the engine was turned over to Engineer Andrews on

the night of the accident, the crown-sheet was carefully examined by the hostler, who delivered the engine to him, and no defects in the crown-sheet were discovered. After Engineer Andrews took charge of the engine and before leaving Roanoke, he is shown to have made an inspection of the crown-sheet by the testimony of the conductor in charge of the train, and he presumably discovered no defects therein. When he arrived in Roanoke from Princeton, West Virginia, on the morning of the day the accident occurred, Engineer Andrews filed a written report certifying that he had carefully inspected this engine and all of its appliances, and he did not report any defect in the crown-sheet. Even the plaintiff's expert witness, Randolph, says (record p. 188) that he never saw a crown-sheet scorched as badly as this one that did not leak unless the spaces were filled up with something, and that any man who knew anything about the inspection of a boiler could have seen that the crown-sheet was burned if he had looked at it, and that a careful man could have seen the leaks from the crown-sheet if it was burned (record p. 861).

The defendant's evidence further showed that after the explosion the engine and its appurtenances were carefully inspected by two expert inspectors of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as by other disinterested persons skilled in such matters, and that all of them were of the opinion that it clearly failed from the absence of water on the crown sheet at the time of the explosion. The fact that this crown-sheet had been burned over a considerable area at the time of or prior to the explosion is established by the testimony of all the witnesses.

The testimony above referred to further establishes conclusively that if it had been burned before the government inspection of November 11, 1912, that it would have been discovered, that Andrews was from that time until the time of the explosion responsible for its inspection, and that if it had been burned prior to the time Andrews started with it on his run on the night of the accident, that either he or the hostler who delivered the engine to him at Roanoke would have discovered it. It further appears that if the engine was burned at any time after November 11, 1912, that Andrews was responsible for it as he was the only one who had run the engine.

The testimony shows that a crown-sheet burned to the extent that this one was will leak unless something is done to it to stop the leakage. There was no evidence to show that anything was done to this crown-sheet to stop the leakage after it was burned. The defendant's witnesses testified that a crown-sheet burned to the extent that

this one was would leak to such an extent that the fire in the fire box would be put out and that the engine could not be operated.

The extent to which a burned crown-sheet would leak was practically demonstrated by the use of an iron drum constructed as the crown-sheet of an engine is constructed. This drum was heated without water in it under pressure sufficient to bulge the sheet between the stay-bolt holes one-sixteenth of an inch. The pocketing of this sheet forming the end of the drum was not sufficient for the plaintiff's expert witness, Randolph, to detect it with his eyes, and as he expressed it, was burned less than the crown-sheet which failed. When water was placed in the drum under pressure, the photographs filed as exhibits and made a part of the record show the extent to which said drum leaked after it had been burned with water in it under pressure. The photographs show that the water runs out in streams around each of the stay-bolt heads.

Some of the plaintiff's witnesses claimed that a burned crown-sheet would leak less than was claimed by defendant's witnesses, and that after the boiler gets hot the leaks will take up to some extent, but none of them claimed that there would not be sufficient leakage in a crown-sheet burned as badly as this one was for the burning to be detected. As already stated, the witness, Randolph, says (record p. 861) that a careful man could have seen the leaks from this crown-sheet after it was burned.

The fact is, therefore, conclusively established that this crown-sheet was burned after Andrews took charge of the engine at Roanoke; otherwise, either he or the witness, Neece, the hostler, who turned the engine over to him, would have discovered that it was burned when they examined it.

The theory that the crown sheet was not burned by Andrews at the time of the failure, and that at the time of failure it had water on it, is based entirely on the testimony of the expert witness, Randolph. This witness testified (record pp. 197-198) that his principal, if not his only reason, for saying that the sheet had water on it when it failed was the color of the sheet at the time he examined it. The testimony of several of the defendant's witnesses was to the effect that the color of iron heated to an intense degree of heat changes materially by the lapse of time. The bright red oxide produced on iron by intense heat by exposure to atmospheric conditions is almost, if not entirely, removed and obliterated. The witness, Randolph, did not see the crown-sheet, or any of the stay-bolts until considerably over a

year after the accident, and when he was testifying about the color and appearance of the sheet, as shown by the record, it was nearly two years after the accident. In addition to this, his own admissions are sufficient to show that his theories and opinions are without foundation and utterly unreliable. When he was on the witness stand, he was shown a number of stay-bolt heads that were picked up in the fire box of the engine after the explosion. He admitted (record p. 878) that when he had previously testified in this case, and the same bolt heads were shown him, that he said "these bolt heads indicate that they have been hot, and that they failed from being hot because they were broken largely where the heat is greatest down in the head".

The character of the testimony of this witness can best be illustrated by reference to his testimony on this point. By reference to pages 876 to 880, it will be found that he first testified that the way the bolt-heads were broken down into the head might or might not indicate that they were broken when hot. When confronted with his statements at the previous trial, he attempted to reconcile his conflicting statements by saying that the color of the bolt-heads was an element that entered into his conclusion that they were broken while hot. He was finally forced to admit that the way the bolt-heads were broken down into the head was one indication that they were broken while hot, and that their color was another indication that they were broken while hot. The fact that the bolt-heads could not have been sufficiently hot to break down into the heads as they did with water on top of the crown-sheet is not controverted, and shows conclusively that at the time these bolt-heads were broken, whether before or at the time of the explosion, there was no water on the crown-sheet.

The witness, Randolph, admits (record pp. 168-178-179) that the convex shape of that portion of the bolt-heads resting against the crown-sheet was caused by the crown-sheet forcing them into that shape at some time before they were broken off. In other words, the contour of the bottom part of the crown-sheet was the same as the contour of the bolt-heads resting against it. The crown-sheet was forced down or bagged between the stay-bolts sufficiently to force the bolt-heads in this shape.

The extent to which the crown-sheet was bagged and the appearance it presented is shown by an exhibit made a part of the record. This exhibit is drawn to a scale representing the actual distances between the stay-bolts, and the portion of the crown-sheet shown in gray is its normal shape or position, and the portion of the crown-

sheet shown in red is the shape reproduced from actual measurements of the bolt-heads that the crown-sheet assumed in order to force the bolt-heads in the shape they were, when picked up in the fire box after the explosion.

The witness, Randolph, admits that the crown-sheet was bagged under pressure with no water on top of it (record p. 165), and that the bagging before the sheet was torn loose from the stay-bolts and forced down a distance of 10¾ inches was greater than the sheet showed after the explosion. He further admits that the sheet offered in evidence showed that it had been seriously injured by heat (record p. 193).

This witness says (record pp. 157-158) that where the stay-bolts are good and the strain is great enough to break them, it has a characteristic effect on the crown-sheet by leaving the depression around the stay-bolt holes made in the sheet by the heads of the stay-bolts, and that this characteristic effect appears on the crown-sheet in question.

The crown sheet showed that the threads in the stay-bolt holes were practically all in a perfect condition. The evidence showed conclusively that the threads on the ends of the stay-bolts, which were screwed into the crown-sheet, were not stripped. If the failure had occurred when the sheet was cold—that is, with water on top of it—the threads would have been stripped, and the witness, Randolph, admits (record pp. 185-186) that the threads would either have been stripped on the crown-sheet or on the stay-bolts. This shows conclusively that at the time of failure the portion of the sheet which failed was so much stretched from being hot, that the stay-bolt holes in the crown-sheet were opened to such an extent that the threads were separated, and the necessary conclusion is that the sheet was hot when the explosion occurred. Notwithstanding the witness, Randolph's, theory that the crown-sheet had water on it at the time it failed, he admits that he never in his experience knew a crown-sheet to be blown down when the top of it was covered with water (record pp. 190-191 and 208-209).

These facts, which were established by uncontradicted testimony, and the admissions of the expert witness, Randolph, show that the theory of the witness, Randolph, that the sheet failed when it was covered with water is not supported by the evidence. The above references to his testimony further show that in many respects his testimony and theories are inconsistent and contradictory, and that his

testimony, therefore, cannot be considered trustworthy and reliable.

The conditions which were found to exist after the happening of this accident show that the water was low and the crown-sheet was burned at the time of the explosion.

The engineer's position is on the right side of the cab. The fireman and the front brakeman, who usually rides in the cab, occupied the seat on the left side of the cab. The valves operating the left injector have to be manipulated on the left side of the cab. The ordinary practice of engineers is where there is not an emergency, and where it is not necessary to get water into the boiler quickly, to require the fireman to turn on the left injector, but where the water is low, and it is not safe to trust the fireman to turn on the left injector, the engineer performs that service himself. Just before the explosion, Jerry Walton says that the brakeman was sitting on the seat-box on the left side and that he had his knees on the rear end of the left seat-box leaning out of the window. In the position the front brakeman was sitting, he would have to move out of the way in order to allow the engineer to manipulate the valves to turn on the left injector. Ordinarily only one injector is used, and the witness, Walton, testifies that only the right injector had been used on that trip. After the explosion the left injector was found turned on. Andrews was blown out on the left side of the cab. The brakeman was blown out on the right side of the cab. The steam which escaped from the exploded boiler and blew the engineer, fireman and brakeman out of the cab came out of the fire box into the cab through the fire box door, which is located in the center of the cab. It is impossible to conceive how Andrews and the brakeman could have been blown across and out of the cab on opposite sides from which they were sitting by this escaping steam. The necessary conclusion from these circumstances is that Andrews had discovered that his water was low and went to the left side of the cab to turn on the left injector, requiring the brakeman to move out of the way to the right side of the cab, and that while they were in this position the explosion occurred, blowing Andrews out on the left of the track, the brakeman on the right side of the track, and the fireman, Walton, through the window on the left side, out of which he was looking.

The defendant's evidence in regard to the alleged ground of negligence that the water glass guage was out of order showed that this water glass guage was examined by the hostler, Neece, before turning the engine over to Andrews, and was found to be in good condition.

After the accident it was tested by the two Interstate Commerce Commission inspectors, and others, who testified that it was in perfect condition and correctly registered water in the boiler. The evidence not only fails to show any defect in the water glass guage, but conclusively establishes that it was in perfect condition.

From the foregoing, it appears that the plaintiff's evidence fails to establish either of the grounds of negligence relied on. It is purely conjectural and speculative, and the most that can be said of it is that it shows that the cause of the explosion is uncertain, and it establishes no fact or facts from which the cause of the explosion can be determined. The defendant's evidence, on the other hand, shows that the explosion must have resulted from a cause for which Engineer Andrews was responsible. The verdict of the jury should, therefore, have been set aside on the ground that it was not supported by the evidence.

The defendant showed by an overwhelming preponderance of trustworthy and reliable testimony that the crown-sheet failed from low water at the time of the explosion, but as the evidence must be considered as on a demurrer to the evidence, this testimony has not been discussed in detail. Only such evidence has been referred to in detail as when considered under this rule, shows that the plaintiff has failed to prove by reliable and substantial evidence the facts necessary to support a verdict in her favor.

II. The second assignment of error is that the court erred in giving instructions offered by the plaintiff.

Instruction No. 1 given for the plaintiff over the objection of the defendant tells the jury that if they believe from the evidence (1) that the stay-bolts had been burned in service and were weak and unsafe; (2) that the stay-bolts had become broken and were weak and unsafe; (3) that the stay-bolts were improperly screwed in and improperly adjusted in construction, and (4) that the stay-bolts were constructed of defective and faulty material, and that the accident resulted solely from any of said causes, they should find for the plaintiff.

Under the first branch of this instruction there is no limit placed on the time when said stay-bolts were burned in service, or how or by whom they might have been burned in service. If the stay-bolts had been burned in service, and were rendered weak and unsafe by Engineer Andrews at any time on that trip, or at any previous time, the

jury were told to find a verdict for the plaintiff. This branch of the instruction is directly in conflict with defendant's Instruction No. 2, which told the jury that if the crown-sheet was burned and rendered unsafe by Andrews after he took charge of the engine on November 14, 1912, the plaintiff could not recover.

That the giving of conflicting instructions is error is so well established as not to require the citation of authority.

There was no evidence justifying the second branch of this instruction, to-wit: that if the stay-bolts had become broken and were, therefore, weak and unsafe, the jury should find for the plaintiff. There was no evidence tending to show that the stay-bolts had become broken and were, therefore, weak and unsafe. The plaintiff's witness, Randolph, was allowed to speculate as to the different ways in which stay-bolts might be rendered unsafe. He testified that they might be weakened by a prior burning. There was no evidence of a prior burning, and if there had been a prior burning, the evidence showed that Andrews was responsible for it. He testified that motion between the top sheet to which these stay-bolts are attached at the top, and the crown-sheet to which they are attached at the bottom, might result in weakening the bolts. His opinion, however, was that it would take a long time for this to happen, and that it would only weaken short bolts, whereas these bolts were long bolts.

The witness Scrivenor advanced the theory that bolts might be weakened by cold draughts of air from the fire box being left open. There was no evidence that the fire box door had been left open, or had been opened at all, except when necessary to fire the engine, and there was absolutely no foundation for this theory.

This branch of the instruction is subject to the further objection that if the stay-bolts had become broken, and were, therefore, weak and unsafe through the fault of Andrews himself, the jury were told that the plaintiff was entitled to recover, which is in conflict with defendant's instruction No. 2, and was improper for that reason.

The third branch of the instruction was objectionable for the same reasons that the second branch was objectionable. There was no sufficient evidence to support the third branch of this instruction. It is true that Randolph testified that, if when said stay-bolts were screwed in, they were not set at right angles to the sheet, they might be injured by one side of the head of the bolt coming in contact with the sheet before the other side of the head came in contact with it,

and that when the bolts were screwed up so as to make a tight fit, it would result in straining one side of the bolts, and that, consequently, the use of a seating tool was an advisable, though not a necessary, practice.

There was no evidence that these bolts were not properly adjusted when they were screwed in, and that the use of a seating tool was required. Witness Randolph further testified that bolts are sometimes weakened by being screwed in without nicks in the head, and that some of the bolts which were produced did not show signs of being nicked in the head. He stated, however, that, if the heads were not twisted off, the heat in the fire box would cause the heads to slough off in a much shorter time than this engine had been in operation, and he finally admitted that any signs of nicks in the heads would in some cases be obliterated by the action of the fire in the fire box (record, pages 871-2-3).

The defendant's evidence, on the contrary, showed by actual experiment with stay-bolts made from the stay-bolts of this engine, that the bolts could not be injured in this way, because the threads of the bolts would strip off before they could be screwed in tight enough to injure the bolts. The defendant's evidence very positively showed that the heads of the bolts of this engine were nicked in a machine before they were screwed in.

The fourth branch of the instruction, that the stay-bolts were constructed of defective and faulty material is absolutely without evidence to support it. The plaintiff produced no evidence to show that defective or faulty material was used in the construction of these bolts. On the other hand, the defendant showed conclusively, by tests of the material before it went into the engine, and tests of the stay-bolts found in the engine after the explosion, that the material was not defective or faulty but was first-class in every particular.

The plaintiff's Instruction No. 2 was to the effect that, if the water glass guage was out of repair and in an unsafe condition, due to the valves being stopped up by lime or other deposits, and incorrectly indicated the water in the boiler, and that Andrews relied on the water glass guage, and that the accident resulted therefrom, they must find for the plaintiff.

In the discussion of Assignment of Error No. 1 it has already been shown that there was absolutely no evidence to support this instruction. If there had been evidence to support it, it was erroneous, because it left out of consideration Andrews' negligence in al-

lowing the valves to become stopped up, and in relying upon the water glass guage when he knew that it was out of order, and had other means of determining whether he had a sufficient quantity of water in the boiler or not. That it is error to give instructions not supported by the evidence is well established by Virginia authorities.

C. & O. Ry. Co. vs. Stock, 104 Va., 108.
C. & O. Ry. Co. vs. Ghee, 110 Va., 527.
American Locomotive Co. vs. Whitlock, 109 Va., 238.
N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Stegall, 107 Va., 231.

The second instruction is wrong, because, if the water glass guage was out of order, Andrews would have known it (record, p. 457), and it was negligence on the part of Andrews to rely on it when it was out of order. The engine was safe to operate without the water glass guage. It was not negligence on the part of the defendant not to provide a water glass guage, or to use the engine, if it was out of order.

Moore Lime Co. vs. Johnston, 103 Va., 84-86.
Piedmont, etc., Co. vs. Patterson, 84 Va., 747.

Both of these instructions directed a verdict for the plaintiff, and left out of consideration entirely the contributory negligence of the plaintiff's intestate. If the defendant's engine was defective in either of the particulars claimed, the evidence clearly shows that Andrews was either responsible for the defect, or that he was guilty of negligence in inspecting the engine and not discovering the defect. If he was guilty of negligence which in either of these ways contributed to his injury, the jury should have been told, as provided for in the Employers' Liability Act, that the amount of recovery should be diminished in proportion to his negligence. Both of these instructions told the jury that they should find for the plaintiff, and by plaintiff's Instruction No. 3 they are told that they should find for the plaintiff the full amount of the damages sustained.

That it was error to give these three instructions without any reference to the contributory negligence of the plaintiff's intestate, and without telling the jury that the damages should be reduced in proportion to such contributory negligence, is too plain to require any further argument.

C. & O. Ry. Co. vs. Sparrow, 98 Va., 630.
N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Earnest, 229 U. S., 114; 57 Lawyers' Ed., 1096.
Illinois Central R. R. Co. vs. Nelson, 203 Fed., 956.

The second instruction was erroneous for the further reason that it appears from the evidence that two appliances were provided for showing the quantity of water in the boiler; that, if the water glass guage gets out of order, the engineer would know it at once: that the guage-cocks afford the most certain way of determining the quantity of water in the boiler, and if the water glass guage was out of order, it was entirely safe to operate the engine by using the guage-cocks to show the quantity of water in the boiler.

Under the Federal Act requiring railroad companies to furnish safe and suitable boilers and appliances, it is provided that the boiler and appurtenances must be safe to operate without unnecessary peril to life or limb. That a boiler provided with guage-cocks and without any water glass, or with a defective water glass, is safe to operate without unnecessary peril to life or limb is conclusively shown by the evidence. It was, therefore, error to base an instruction on a theory that the water glass being defective or out of order rendered the engine unsafe to operate. Where two appliances are furnished for the same purpose, and the engineer may use either at his election, it is not negligence to permit the engine to be used in service, if one of these appliances happens to be defective or out of order.

Moore Lime Co. vs. Johnston, 103 Va., 86.

If it can be said that the plaintiff's evidence furnished a sufficient foundation for an inference of negligence against the defendant, on either of the alleged grounds of negligence covered by the first two instructions, the evidence conclusively shows that Andrews himself was guilty of negligence. That the crown-sheet was burned at some time is conclusively established. Engineer Andrews was responsible either for burning it, or for failing to inspect it properly and discover that it was burned. The same is true of the water glass guage. If it was out of order, Engineer Andrews was responsible for letting it get out of order, or for not discovering that it was out of order, and it was his duty either to correct the defect, or to use the guage-cocks which were provided.

In any view that may be taken of the theories of negligence covered by these instructions, they were erroneous, either in that they were without evidence on which to base them, or they left entirely out of view the contributory negligence of Engineer Andrews.

III. The third assignment of error is to the ruling of the court in refusing to give instructions offered by the defendant.

Defendant's Instruction No. *A*, which was refused by the court, was to the effect that, if the crown-sheet of the engine was burned and rendered unsafe after the inspection of November 11th, 1912, and that Andrews was solely responsible for the said crown-sheet being burned, whether it occurred at the time of failure or prior thereto, after such inspection, the plaintiff cannot recover in this case.

This instruction was to the effect that Andrews should be held responsible for his own negligence, which was the sole cause of the accident. The rules of the company were introduced showing that the engineer was required to inspect his engine at the beginning and at the end of each trip. From the time of the inspection on November 11th, 1912, until the happening of the accident, the duty of inspecting this engine was placed solely upon Engineer Andrews (record, pp. 783-4). No one else had run this engine from the time of this inspection until the happening of the accident. If the engine was burned between the time of this inspection and the happening of the accident, Engineer Andrews was responsible for it, and the negligence of no one else could have intervened and contributed to his injury.

The court should, therefore, have given this instruction as it was offered; but the court refused to give this instruction as offered, but gave it as amended as Instruction No. 2, holding Engineer Andrews responsible for burning the crown-sheet and rendering it unsafe after the engine was delivered to him on the evening of November 14, 1912. It is hard to understand on what theory the court could hold him responsible for negligence which was the sole cause of the accident, which occurred after the engine was delivered to him on the evening of November 14, 1912, and not hold him responsible for negligence which was the sole cause of the accident, which occurred after November 11th, 1912, when the evidence fails to show that the negligence of any one else which contributed to the injury had intervened.

Instruction No. *B* offered by the defendant and refused by the court should have been given. The object of this instruction was to eliminate the other charges of negligence set out in the declaration, of which there was no proof whatever, and to tell the jury that as to the only elements of negligence of which there was any proof, the burden was on the plaintiff to show that some one other than Andrews himself had been guilty of negligence. This instruction embodies the simple proposition that the plaintiff must prove negligence, and that there is no burden on the defendant to explain the accident or to show that no one else was negligent. If some one other than Andrews had been

guilty of negligence, which contributed to the accident, the burden was on the plaintiff to prove such negligence, and it was not the duty of the defendant to show that no one else was guilty of negligence.

Instruction No. *C* which was offered by the defendant after Instruction *B* was refused, was the same as Instruction *B* except that it took into consideration the manner of screwing the stay-bolts into the crown-sheet. If Instruction B was improper on account of leaving out of consideration an element as to which it might be claimed there was some evidence, In struction *C* certainly covered the whole case and should have been given.

Instruction No. *D* offered by the defendant should have been given. It was to the effect that, if the duty to inspect this engine was imposed on Andrews alone after November 11th, 1914, and he failed to perform this duty, and the accident resulted from such failure, the plaintiff cannot recover.

As already shown, Engineer Andrews was alone responsible for the inspection of this engine and reporting defects therein, from the time of inspection on November 11th, 1912, until the accident occurred. If the accident resulted from his failure to properly perform this duty, then his failure in this regard was the proximate cause of the accident. It would seem self-evident that, if an engineer is given an engine in perfect condition, and the duty is imposed on him to inspect it and report defects therein, for a certain period, and he fails to properly inspect the engine, and as a consequence, injury results to him, he cannot recover.

IV. The fourth assignment of error is to the ruling of the court in admitting improper evidence offered by the plaintiff.

In all there were fifteen exceptions taken during the course of the trial to the rulings of the court in admitting improper testimony. Of these fifteen exceptions the third, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and nineteenth are so similar that they may be discussed together.

The principal objection to the evidence covered by all of these exceptions is that it was purely speculative and conjectural, and was not based on any facts proved in the case, and was not relevant to the issue involved in the case.

Under the principles established by the cases cited under the second assignment of error, the plaintiff in a case of this character

must prove his case by reliable and substantial evidence. It follows that evidence which is purely speculative and conjectural and not based upon any known or established facts is improper and should not be admitted.

The evidence of Jerry Walton, covered by Exception No. 3, is further objectionable on the ground that he was allowed to express an opinion to the effect that, if the crown-sheet had been heated red hot, he would have been bound to have seen it in firing the engine, when his testimony showed that he had had absolutely no experience with red hot crown-sheets, and that the facts upon which this opinion was based were not within his knowledge.

The same objection applies to the testimony of G. A. Richardson, embodied in Bill of Exceptions No. 4. This witness was allowed to express an opinion and say that, in his judgment, a hot crown-sheet would give a different light or glow in the fire box, when he had never seen a red-hot crown-sheet and had no experience or knowledge upon which to base such an opinion.

The evidence of the witness, Arthur Scrivenor, embodied in Exception No. 6, was objectionable for the same reason. This witness was allowed to express an opinion as to what the present appearance of the crown-sheet indicated, when he had no experience with burned crown-sheets, and no knowledge upon which such opinion was based.

The evidence embodied in Exception No. 7 is speculative and conjectural in the extreme. The witness was permitted to testify as to the effect sometimes produced upon crown-sheet bolts by cold draughts admitted by opening the fire box door. As already pointed out, there was no evidence of opening the fire-box door except for the necessary purpose of firing the engine, and if such draughts were admitted in the necessary firing of the engine, then certainly the defendant could not be held responsible for the effects thereof. As a matter of fact, the testimony in this case shows, as may be plainly seen from the exhibits, that a brick arch extends from the back of the fire box forward to within a few inches of the front of the fire box, which would prevent cold draughts from striking the crown-sheet. The object of this brick arch is to concentrate the heat on the bottom of the crown-sheet, and it is obvious that the crown-sheet would not be exposed to cold draughts with a hot fire in the fire box.

Exception No. 8 is to the testimony of L. S. Randolph to the effect that mud or oil left on a crown-sheet might cause it to burn with water on top of it.

There was absolutely no evidence to show that mud or oil was on this crown-sheet, and there was no foundation for the speculative theory advanced by this witness. On the contrary, the evidence showed that the crown-sheet was thoroughly cleaned before it was delivered by the Locomotive Works, and was washed out every ten days after it was put in service.

Exception No 9 is to the evidence of L. S. Randolph to the effect that it would not be possible for scale or lime salts to be deposited in the water glass so as to stop it up and cause it to register improperly, between the time the engine left Roanoke and the time the accident occurred. There was no evidence that the water glass was stopped up or registered improperly at any time. The speculative opinion of this witness was not based on any facts proved in the case.

The same is true of the evidence of this witness embodied in Exception No. 10. There was no evidence to the effect that in an engine constructed as this one was, that there would be any motion between the top sheet or "wagon top", and the crown-sheet, that would result in weakening the stay-bolt heads. The witness himself stated that such motion would not even weaken short bolts of a crown-sheet seriously, unless the engine was running a long time. This evidence in no way tended to show that the crown-sheet in question was blown out on account of the weakening of the stay-bolts in this manner, and the evidence should not have been admitted.

The same objections heretofore discussed are applicable to the testimony embodied in Exceptions No. 11 and No. 12.

Exception No. 14 is to the evidence which the court permitted to be brought out on cross-examination of defendant's witness, A. H. McGhee, to the effect that engine No. 473 had been inspected by him and reported in good condition; when, in fact, the crown-sheet had filings on it, which afterwards caused it to burn. The engine involved in this case was No. 469. Evidence of defects in other engines was improper, and if this evidence even tended to show the failure of this witness to properly inspect other engines, it was improper. To go into the question of the burning of the crown-sheet of engine No. 73 would raise collateral issues, and the fact that this witness failed to discover the filings on the sheet of engine No. 473 does not show that he did not properly inspect engine No. 469.

N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Biggs, 103 Va., 110.

The evidence embodied in Exception No. 19 to the effect that

leaks in crown-sheets could be stopped by the use of saw-dust, bran or any fibrous material of that kind, was improper, because there was absolutely no evidence of the use of such materials for stopping the leaks in this crown-sheet, and no facts were proved from which an inference might arise that the leaks had been stopped by the use of such materials.

The foregoing exceptions show the manner in which the court below permitted this case to be tried. The plaintiff's counsel and expert witnesses were allowed to embark upon any field of speculation and conjecture that their imaginations could suggest. They were not restricted to proving facts from which it might be inferred how and why this accident happened, but were allowed to offer every speculative theory that they could think of, to show that it might have resulted from some other cause than low water in the engine.

Exception No. 5 is to the ruling of the court in allowing the witness Arthur Scrivenor to give his opinion as an expert witness as to the condition of the crown-sheet, and generally, as to his qualifications to testify as an expert.

The evidence of this witness shows that he had never had any experience in the construction or maintenance of locomotive boilers, and had never had any occasion to investigate the causes of boiler explosions; that his only experience with locomotives within the last twenty years was as a draftsman in the shops of the Richmond Locomotive Works, and that there he did not come in contact with the actual construction of the boilers; that since that time he had only been concerned with the up-keep of stationary boilers, and that the character of the boilers on locomotive engines has greatly changed since he had anything to do with them. It is true that he stated that he thought that he was competent to give an opinion on the subject; but the mere expression by the witness of his belief that he is an expert is not sufficient to qualify him as an expert. He must testify to some facts which show his skill and experience in the business as to which he is attempting to give an expert opinion, and must show that he is possessed of such knowledge or experience on the subject as qualify him to testify as an expert.

Commonwealth vs. Larkin, 88 Va., 422.

N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Corletto, 100 Va., 355.

The whole testimony of this witness shows that he was not possessed of such knowledge on this subject as would entitle his opinion to any weight, and his opinion evidence should have been excluded.

Exception No. 13 is to the testimony of G. W. Mitchell as to the expectancy of Andrews' life. This witness gave the expectancy from what he called the American Experience Tables of Mortality, which tables he testified were made up by the Life Insurance Companies from the experience of those companies as to the life of the average man. He further testified that the occupation of a railroad engineer is more hazardous than that of an ordinary man, so much more so that insurance companies would not insure the lives of such engineers, except under a special form of policy taking higher rates than those of the ordinary man.

The plaintiff testified that her intestate was not a man in ordinary good health; that he was frequently sick and had to lay off from his run on that account.

While we are aware that this Court has in other cases held that the expectancy as determined by such tables is admissible evidence, we respectfully submit that, where the evidence shows that the person whose life is the subject of investigation belongs to a different class from those included in the tables, and where he is following a hazardous occupation, such tables should not be admitted.

V. The firth assignment of error is as to the action of the court in excluding proper evidence offered by the defendant.

Exception No. 15 is as to the action of the court in sustaining the objection to the testimony of H. L. Thomas, that, if the engineer discovered that the water was so low as to endanger his crown-sheet, and wanted to put on the left injector of the engine quickly so as to avoid an explosion, he would perform this work himself, and not trust the fireman to do it. This evidence supports the defendant's theory that Andrews would have gone to the left side of the cab to put the left injector on, when he discovered that there was danger of an explosion. The evidence excluded is simply evidence of the common practice of engineers under the circumstances related, and was directly in support of the defendant's theory that the way Andrews happened to be blown out of the left side of the engine was due to the fact that he discovered his water was low and had gone to that side of the engine to put on the left injector. The witness was an experienced engineer and was well qualified to testify as to the practice of engineers under such circumstances.

Exception No. 16 is to the action of the court in sustaining the objection to the testimony of N. W. Sample as to the amount of the

pressure necessary to force the crown-sheet into the shape that it assumed after the explosion (it being bagged about ten and three-fourths inches), and that the pressure from one hundred and eighty-five pounds of steam could not have forced it into that shape when it was cold. The witness Randolph had testified that the ordinary working pressure to the engine, of one hundred and eighty-five pounds of steam, could force the sheet into that shape, if a dozen or so stay-bolts were broken. It was certainly proper to allow the defendant to rebut this evidence by showing by the witness Sample that it was necessary to use a great deal more pressure than one hundred and eighty-five pounds would exert in order to force a sheet of this strength into that shape when cold, and to show that it was necessary to use not a pressure of one hundred and eighty-five pounds to do this, but that a pressure of practically one thousand tons was necessary. The witness gave the source of his information, and the reasons for the opinion that he expressed. The court ruled the evidence out on the ground that it was evidence of an experiment. The evidence ruled out was not evidence of an experiment, but was evidence of the methods used for bending sheets of this character, from the observation of which the witness formed his opinion as to the amount of pressure necessary to bend the sheet in the way that this sheet was bent.

Exception No. 17 is to the action of the court in sustaining the objection of the plaintiff to the testimony of Doanberger, that certain bolts which were produced and shown to the jury were bolts taken from the Norfolk & Western engine blown up from low water at Alleghany Tunnel, and that these bolts broke like the bolts on engine No. 469 broke when it exploded. The witness Randolph had testified that he had seen the Norfolk & Western engine near Alleghany Tunnel, and that it had undoubtedly exploded from low water. He had also testified that certain bolts, which were also shown to the jury, and which came from engine No. 469, presented the appearance of having been broken cold.

The purpose of this evidence was to show the jury bolts which had admittedly come from an engine which had exploded from low water, and which had admittedly broken when hot, and allow them to compare these bolts with the bolts taken from engine 469, and to test for themselves the accuracy of Professor Randolph's opinions.

Exception No. 18 is to the action of the court in sustaining the

objection to the testimony of the witness Slayton, to the effect that it was the duty and the custom of engineers to inspect the water glass before starting on their runs.

One ground of negligence charged was that the water glass was defective. The written rule requiring the engineer to inspect the engine and all its appurtenances before, during and after each trip, had been introduced in evidence, and the testimony excluded was simply to show the application of that rule, and that the water glass was one of the appurtenances of the engine which the engineer was, under that rule, required to inspect, and that engineers did, in fact, always inspect the water glass before starting on a run. This evidence was pertinent, because, if Andrews had performed his duty by inspecting the water glass before starting on his run, and had found it defective, he should have known that it was defective, and should have used his guage-cocks instead.

The evidence further tended to show that the water glass was not defective, or that, if it was defective, Andrews should have known it, and was guilty of negligence in relying on the water glass, when he had other safe means at hand of ascertaining how much water was in his boiler.

Exception No. 20 is to the ruling of the court in refusing to permit the witnesses C. M. Butler and W. R. Moore to testifying to the fact that Andrews was discharged from the Atlantic Coast Line Railway for burning an engine. The personal record of Andrews with the Atlantic Coast Line was produced, which showed that he had been discharged for burning the crown-sheet of an engine. Andrews himself knew what his personal record showed, and that record showed that he had authorized the Atlantic Coast Line to furnish other railroad companies the information contained therein, and to state to other railroads the reason for his discharge.

This evidence being directly responsive to the evidence introduced by the plaintiff to show that he was a careful and competent engineer, was admissible for the purpose of contradicting that evidence, and was further admissible to show that his reputation as an engineer was not good, and that his earning capacity was, therefore, diminished.

VI. The sixth assignment of error is to the action of the court in refusing to set aside the verdict on the ground that the damages allowed were excessive.

Under the Employers.' Liability Act the damages are limited to compensation for the pecuniary loss sustained by the death of the decedent.

Michigan Central R. R. Co. vs. Vreeland, 227 U. S., 59; 57 Lawyers' Ed., 417.

The evidence of Mrs. Andrews is that her intestate earned from one hundred and twenty-five to two hundred dollars per month, and that he supported his family properly. The plaintiff would, therefore, only be entitled to such a sum as would have produced, exclusive of what it would have required for her intestate's maintenance and support, an income of approximately what he was contributing to his family during that period. From all the evidence it is certain that he was not contributing more than about twelve hundred dollars a year to the support of his family. The amount of the verdict at the legal rate of interest will produce twelve hundred dollars per year indefinitely, and at the expiration of Andrews' expectancy of life, the sum of twenty thousand dollars will still remain when, under the Employers' Liability Act, as construed by the above decisions, the plaintiff was only entitled to recover such sum as would be contributed to the support of herself and children during the lifetime of her intestate.

The verdict of the jury was excessive for the further reason that it allowed fully as much, if not more, than would compensate his wife and children for the pecuniary loss that they have sustained, without diminishing the recovery as required by the Act, in proportion to the contributory negligence of which Andrews was guilty. If the evidence can be considered sufficient to sustain a verdict on either of the alleged theories of the defendant's negligence, it conclusively shows that Andrews was guilty of contributory negligence, and the recovery should, therefore, have been diminished in the proportion that his negligence contributed to the injury.

VII. The seventh assignment of error is that the court below had no jurisdiction to try this case because the trial of the case by a jury of seven is in violation of the seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution.

The cause of action on which this action was based was created by the act of Congress, known as the Federal Employers' Liability Act. By an amendment to the sixth section of this act, the court of the several states are given concurrent jurisdiction with the courts

of the United States, and it is provided that no case brought in any state court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States.

The seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution provides that in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved. The trial by jury which the seventh amendment requires is a trial by such a jury as the common law of England provided for; that is, a jury of twelve men.

Capital Traction Co. v. Hof., 174 U. S. page 1; 43 L. Ed. p. 873.

The Virginia Constitution, section 11, provides that the legislature may limit the number of jurors in civil cases. Pursuant to this authority, the legislature, by section 3166 of the Code, has provided for a jury of seven in cases not cognizable by a Justice of the Peace.

The record shows that the case at bar was tried by a jury of seven. The cause of action having been created by Congress, and the jurisdiction to try this case having been conferred on the Circuit Court of Montgomery County by an act of Congress, Congress had no power, under the limitation imposed by the seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution, to confer jurisdiction to try a cause of action created by it on a court with a jury of less than twelve men.

It has been held that it is beyond the power of Congress to confer jurisdiction to try causes of action created by it unless the particular court is so constituted as to satisfy the seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution. The seventh amendment requires that all the substantial elements of a common law jury trial shall be preserved.

Springfield City v. Thomas, 166 U. S. 707, 41 L. Ed. 1172.

American Pub. Co. v. Fisher, 166 U. S. 464, 41 L. Ed. 1079.

The trial of this case, therefore, by a jury of seven men was not such a trial as is provided for by the seventh amendment of the Constitution, and no valid verdict on which the court could enter judgment could be rendered by a jury so constituted.

This objection to the jurisdiction of the court, or to the trial of

the case by a jury of seven, was not made in the court below. The fact that it was not made in the court below does not prevent the question being raised in the appellate court. The trial which was had, being in violation of the Federal Constitution, amounted to no trial at all. When the court attempted to try this case with a jury of seven by virtue of the constitution, it had no jurisdiction of the subject matter of the action.

The principle is familiar that where there is a want of jurisdiction of the subject matter, the consent of parties cannot give jurisdiction. A party cannot be held to have waived the right to object to the jurisdiction of a court that has no jurisdiction of the subject matter.

8 Encyc. Digest of Va. and W. Va., Rep. p. 904, and cases cited.

Where it appears from the proceedings that there is a want of jurisdiction of the subject matter, objection can be made to the jurisdiction for the first time in the appellate court.

1st Encyc. Digest Va. and W. Va. Rep. 548, and cases cited.

It is, therefore, submitted that the trial of this case in the court below by a jury of seven in violation of the seventh amendment to the Federal Constitution rendered the proceedings in said court a nullity, and the verdict and judgment thereon should, therefore, be set aside and annulled.

For the reasons assigned in the foregoing petition, your petitioner prays that a writ of error and supersedeas may be awarded to it, and that the judgment complained of herein may be reviewed and reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
By Counsel.

ELLETT & PHLEGER,
G. A. WINGFIELD,
HALL, WOODS & COXE.
Attorneys for the Petitioner.

I, H. T. Hall, an attorney practicing in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, do certify that in my opinion the judgment

complained of in the foregoing petition is erroneous, and should be reviewed and reversed.

H. T. Hall.

Roanoke, Va., December 30th, 1914.

Received Dec. 31, 1914. R. H. C.

Writ of error and supersedeas awarded. Bond $22,000.00.

John A. Buchanan.

To Clerk of Court at Wytheville.

RECORD.

VIRGINIA:

Pleas before the Circuit Court for the County of Montgomery, Virginia, at first April Rules, 1914.

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

Be it remembered that at rules held for the Circuit Court for the County of Montgomery, Virginia, on the first Monday in April, 1914, came the plaintiff and filed her original declaration, which is in the words and figures following, to-wit:

Virginia:

In the Circuit Court for the County of Montgomery.

Maude L. Andrews, Admrx. of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v.

Virginian Railway Company.

DECLARATION.

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, complains of the Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, with its principal office in the State of Virginia, of a plea of trespass on the case, for this, to-wit:

FIRST COUNT.

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia;

That at 10:20 p. m. on said day the said defendant was running

and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer on engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight
[2] train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

Whereupon it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of said locomotive No. 469 and the appurtenances thereof in proper condition and safe to operate at said time in the service of pulling the said train as aforesaid.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler, or with a boiler not in proper condition, said boiler being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in the service to which the same was being put, in this, to-wit: that said boiler was defectively and improperly built and constructed, and improperly fastened and joined to the roof or top of said engine, and that the stay-bolts and crown bolts of said boiler were improperly screwed in and improperly adjusted in construction, and that the said crown-sheet of said boiler and the crown-bolts and stay-bolts thereof were constructed of defective and faulty material and by defective and faulty workmanship, and that the crown-sheet of said boiler at said time was weak and had been
[3] previously burned in service, and the stay-bolts and crown-bolts had been burned in service and were broken and were weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the ordinary pressure and strain imposed upon them by the steam which would ordinarily be generated in said boiler in the customary service of the said engine.

And the plaintiff avers that on the said 14th day of November, 1912, at about 10:20 p. m. on said day, at a point in Montgomery County, Virginia, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff's intestate was engaged in the performance of his said duties as engineer on said locomotive No. 469 in pulling said train of cars as aforesaid, the crown-sheet of the boiler of said engine No. 469 gave way as a result of said improper and

unsafe condition, and the water and steam from the boiler of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water burst out of and through the stoker holes and into the cab of the engine, and scalded, injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he
[4] was in the cab of his engine in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven; Martha J. Andrews, aged five years; Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate; and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews in this, to-wit, that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood, support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life, and that the said children have been deprived of his services for their care and education, and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

[5] SECOND COUNT.

And for this, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 p. m. on said day the said defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer on said engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

Whereupon it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of said locomotive No. 469 and the appurtenances thereof in proper condition and safe to operate at said time in the service of pulling the said train as aforesaid.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler and appurtenances thereof, and with a boiler and appurtenances thereof not in proper condition, said boiler and appurtenances thereof being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in the service to which
[6] they were being put, in this, to-wit: that the injector on the engineer's side of said engine No. 469 was out of repair and failed to properly pump water from the tank of said engine into the boiler, and that the hose which conducted water into said injector had become stopped up and clogged so as not to allow water to flow freely from the tank into the said injector as it should have done; and that the valves of said injector were out of repair and not in proper working condition, and that the said injector was in a defective condition in other respects unknown to this complainant, and failed to properly pump water from the tank of said engine into the boiler.

And the plaintiff avers that on said day the said A. W. Andrews left Roanoke, Virginia, at 9:30 p. m. and operated, used and worked the injector on his said side of said engine continuously from the time he left Roanoke until the time of the explosion, as hereinafter set out.

And the plaintiff avers that a few moments prior to the explosion as hereinafter set out, the glass water guage of said engine No. 469 registered and indicated that the boiler of said engine was two-thirds full of water.

And plaintiff avers that about 10:20 p. m. of said day, at a point in Montgomery County, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on locomotive No. 469, in pulling the said train of cars as aforesaid, the crown-sheet of the boiler of said loco-
[7] motive gave way, and the water and steam in the boiler of said engine rushed down in the fire box of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water rushed out of and through the stoker holes and into the cab of said engine and scalded and injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of his engine in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that the giving way of said crown-sheet and the explosion and bursting of the boiler of said engine as afore-

said, was caused directly and proximately by the fact that the injector on the engineer's side of said locomotive was in an unsafe and improper condition, and did not properly pump the water from the
[8] tank into the boiler of said engine. And the plaintiff avers that if said injector had been working properly and had been in safe condition there would have been ample water in the boiler of said engine to have generated the proper amount of steam without any explosion or injury to the crown-sheet of said boiler.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven years; Martha J. Andrews, aged five years; Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews, in this, to-wit: that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood, support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life, and that the said children have been deprived of his services for their care and education, and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

[9] THIRD COUNT.

And for this also, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 p. m. on said day the said defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such

engineer on said engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

Whereupon it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of said locomotive No. 469 and the appurtenances thereof in proper condition and safe to operate at said time in the service of pulling the said train as aforesaid.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler and appurtenances thereof not in proper condition, said boiler and appurtenances thereof being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in
[10] the service to which they were being put, in this, to-wit: that the glass water guage intended and ordinarily used for the purpose of registering and indicating to the engineer and fireman the quantity of water contained in the boiler of said engine at any and all times, was out of repair and in an unsafe condition, and the valves or holes at the bottom or top through which the water was supposed to circulate and flow were stopped up by lime and trash and deposits and by other substances, and that said glass water guage was otherwise out of repair and in an unsafe condition in divers other ways unknown to this complainant, and that said glass water guage improperly and erroneously registered the quantity of water contained in said boiler.

And the plaintiff avers that on said day the said A. W. Andrews left Roanoke, Virginia, at 9:30 p. m. and operated, used and worked the injector on his said side of said engine continually from the time he left Roanoke until the time of the explosion, as hereinafter set out.

And the plaintiff avers that a few moments prior to the explosion as hereinafter set out, the glass water guage of said engine No. 469 registered and indicated that the boiler of said engine was two-thirds full of water.

And plaintiff avers that about 10:20 p. m. of said day, at a point in Montgomery County, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on locomotive No. 469, in pulling the said train of cars as aforesaid, the crown-sheet of the boiler of said loco-
[11] motive gave way, and the water and steam in the boiler of said engine rushed down in the fire box of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water rushed out of and through the stoker holes and into the cab of said engine, and scalded and injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of his engine, in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he

died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that the giving way of said crown-sheet and the explosion and bursting of the boiler of said engine, as aforesaid, was caused directly and proximately by the fact that the glass water guage of said engine was in an unsafe and improper condition as above alleged, and incorrectly and erroneously registered and indicated that said boiler was two-thirds full of water, while the truth was that the water in said boiler was very low, and the absence of a proper quantity of water caused the crown-sheet of said boiler to give way from the pressure of the steam as aforesaid. And the plaintiff avers

[12] that if said water guage of said engine had properly registered the quantity of water in said boiler said plaintiff's intestate and his fireman could have used other means for the purpose of pumping or forcing water from the tank into the said boiler, and could thus have avoided the explosion, and injury and death of the said plaintiff's intestate.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven years; Martha J. Andrews, aged five years; Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews, in this, to-wit: that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood, support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life, and that the said children have been deprived of his services for their care and education, and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

[13] FOURTH COUNT.

And for this, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 p. m. on said day, the said defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer, on said engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

And the plaintiff avers that the fire box of the said engine No. 469 was located immediately beneath the boiler of said engine, and that in the event of a failure in the crown-sheet of the boiler of said engine the water and steam therefrom would necessarily rush down into the fire box with great force and violence, and force and
[14] blow out the coals and cinders from said fire box into and through any opening or weak point in the walls around said fire box which should happen to give way.

And the plaintiff avers that it is a recognized fact among all railroad employees and workmen and among all people engaged in the business of running engines, that failure of the crown-sheet of the boiler of a locomotive is an occurrence which may happen at any time, and is one of the most imminent dangers to be guarded against in the operation and running of a locomotive, and that railroad companies have employed such devices known as "soft plugs" located in the crown-sheets of said boilers as a protection against the giving away of said crown-sheets, and that railroad companies now use an automatic appliance known as a low water alarm, which automatically reveals to the engineer the fact that the water in the boiler of the locomotive is low.

And plaintiff avers that there was only one partition between the said fire box and the cab of said engine where the said A. W. Andrews was at all times engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on said engine or locomotive, and that in the event of the failure of the crown-sheet of said locomotive, the only partition which
[15] would separate the said A. W. Andrews from the violence and force of the explosion due to the giving away of said crown-

sheet, would be said partition between said fire box and the cab of said engine.

And the plaintiff avers that at all times while he was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on said locomotive, that there was danger that the crown-sheet of said locomotive would fail, and that the said partition which separated the cab of the said engine from the fire box would be subjected to a violent strain and pressure resulting from said explosion.

And the plaintiff avers that a reasonable strong and firm partition was necessary between the said fire box and the cab of said engine in order to protect plaintiff's intestate from known and recognized dangers which arise from the failure of the crown-sheets of boilers and the consequent explosion thereof.

Whereupon it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to use reasonable care to provide a safe place wherein the plaintiff's intestate could perform his duties as engineer on said locomotive as aforesaid.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have a number, to-wit: —— stoker holes cut into the partition between said fire box and the said engineer's cab of said engine, and that the said stoker holes had been cut into the said partition of said engine for the purpose of fastening on to said partition a stoker for use in firing said engine: but said defendant had never used a stoker on said engine, and did negligently and wilfully fail to properly cover or build over the said openings or exposures made by said stoker holes, but did have a covering over the said stoker holes consisting of a very thin, weak and inefficient metal, to-wit: sheet iron, which was incapable of withstanding anything like the pressure to which the same would be subjected in the event that the crown sheet in the boiler of said engine should fail or give way as aforesaid.

And the plaintiff avers that on the said 14th day of November, 1912, about 10:20 p. m., at a point in Montgomery County, Virginia, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on locomotive No. 469, in pulling the said train and cars as aforesaid, the crown-sheet of the boiler of said engine No. 469 gave way, and the water and steam from the boiler of said engine rushed
[17] down into the fire box of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water burst out of and through the

stoker holes and into the cab of said engine, and scalded, injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of his engine in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that the injury to and death of the said plaintiff's intestate was the direct and proximate cause of the failure of the said defendant in not using reasonable care to properly and efficiently cover over said stoker holes, and that if said stoker holes had been covered over with reasonable safety the said plaintiff's intestate would not have received any material or serious injury as a result of said explosion.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven years; Martha J. Andrews, aged five years; Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews, in this, to-wit: that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood, support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life, and that the said children have been deprived of his services for their care and education, and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

Wherefore, the plaintiff says that she has been damaged in the sum of $50,000.00, and hence she brings her suit.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.
By Counsel.

ABRAM P. STAPLES, JR.,
A. B. HUNT, *p. q.*

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[2] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 1.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff

and the defendant, to maintain the issues on their parts respectively, introduced the following evidence:

MONDAY, OCTOBER 5th, 1914.

The above entitled cause was called for trial at four o'clock p. m. Monday, October the 5th, 1914, the jury were sworn to try the case, and the opening statements were made by counsel for plaintiff and defendant, and court adjourned until tomorrow morning, Tuesday, October the 6th, 1914.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6th, 1914—MORNING SESSION.

[3] EVIDENCE INTRODUCED IN BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF.

JERRE WALTON.

Jerre Walton, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Walton, what is your age?
A. Thirty-two.
Q. Where do you live?
A. Fayette County, West Virginia.
Q. Where were you at work on November the 12th, 1912?
A. Where was I working?
Q. Yes?
A. For the Virginian Railway.
Q. In what capacity?
A. Fireman.
Q. Did you know Mr. Andrews?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Were you with him the day that he was killed?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Where was he killed?

[4] A. He was killed eighteen miles out of Roanoke, I understood, on the Virginian Railroad.

Q. On the Virginian Railroad?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. In Montgomery County, was it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was he doing, was he running an engine?

A. Yes, sir; he was the engineer.

Q. And you were the fireman for that engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was on the engine at the time he was killed?

A. Nobody but myself and a brakeman named Lucas and Mr. Andrews.

Q. The brakeman and Mr. Andrews and yourself?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is Mr. Lucas?

A. He was killed.

Q. He was killed also?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that?

A. November the 14th, 1912.

Q. What time did you leave Roanoke on that day or night?

A. We were called to leave 8:45.

[5] Q. In the evening or morning?

A. In the evening.

Q. At what time did this accident occur?

A. Between 10:10 and 10:20.

Q. Will you state whether or not it is your duty as fireman to ascertain whether there is a proper amount of water in the boiler of the engine and in the tender when you start on a trip?

A. Yes, sir; it is my business to see about the water in the tender when we are starting, but for keeping water in the boiler I had nothing to do with it.

Q. Keeping water in the boiler, you had nothing to do with that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Was it within your line of duty to see that the water was in the boiler when you began a trip or when you started?

A. No, sir; it was not my duty.

Q. Whose duty was that, the engineer's?

A. Yes, sir; the engineer's.

Q. You may state, if you happen to know, whether or not you had water in the boiler and in the tank also when this trip was begun?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As you left Roanoke about how much water was in the boiler?

A. It was a little better than half full, the glass was, when [6] we left.

Q. The glass was more than half full; what glass do you mean?

A. That indicates the water.

Q. Where is that glass arranged?

A. It is right on the head of the boiler.

Q. Is it where you, as fireman, can see it plainly?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. On which side of the engine is that glass located, on the side next to the engineer or where the fireman stays?

A. On the side next to the engineer.

Q. Now, what did Mr. Andrews, the engineer, do when he started on that trip after you got started; what did he do, if anything, with reference to the injector—was the injector on or off?

A. He put the injector on right after we got out of the switch on to the main line.

Q. Near the Roanoke yard?

A. Yes, sir; leaving the yard.

Q. Which injector was that, the right or left injector?

A. It was the right injector.

Q. Will you tell the jury whether or not that injector stayed on from that time until the accident?

A. It did.

Q. Mr. Walton, you had been firing how long?

A. As well as I remember, eighteen months.

Q. Will one injector supply the engine, working under the [7] condition that that engine was working that day?

A. Yes, sir; it had been doing it.

Q. Tell the jury whether or not a fireman can tell whether the injector is working.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any trouble with the injector at all?

A. None at all.

Q. Will you state whether or not it was throwing water into the boiler?

A. As indicated by the glass, the water was going into the boiler.

Q. The glass showed that it was?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell apart from the glass whether or not it was, when you opened the door to fire?

A. How is that?

Q. Apart from the glass, not considering the glass indicator, now, can you tell independently of that whether or not the water was being thrown into the boiler by means of the injector, when you opened the door to fire?

A. You mean could you know whether the injector was working or not working?

Q. Yes?

A. Yes, sir; you could tell.

Q. How could you tell that?

A. By the sound of the water going through the pipe.

Q. Is that a difficult matter to determine or an easy matter?

[8] A. That is an easy matter, any one could tell if the injector was working.

Q. And you tell the jury when you opened the door to fire the engine you know the injector was throwing water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; it indicated it on the glass and you could hear the sound of it.

Q. When was the last time before the accident that you noticed that the injector was working?

A. Just as we were coming along by Singer water tank.

Q. What did you have to do there at that point?

A. I looked at the glass—I asked him before we came up there if he was going to take water, and he said no, he was making a nice run or something like that.

By Mr. Hall:

Don't say what he said, just say whether you took water or not.

Witness:

No, sir; we did not take water; he said he was making a nice run and—

By Mr. Hall:

(Interposing) Don't say what he said.

Q. Don't say what Mr. Andrews said to you.

By the Court:

Just tell what you did.

A. I put in fire there after I looked at the glass.

Q. You said you did not put in any water because you did not think it was necessary?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now leave out what Mr. Andrews said.

[9] A. Very well. I put fire in there and just before putting the fire in it, I looked at the glass and the glass indicated that much from the top (indicating with finger). That is the last time I looked on the indicator from the time the engine blew up or blowed down.

Q. That was at Singer tank?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you attend to your fire again after passing Singer tank?

A. It was soon after that, but I couldn't exactly say. I throwed in about three shovels of coal and stepped up out of the gangway up on the window and leaned out of the window, and just as I stepped up there and leaned out, this accident happened.

Q. Then, do you mean to tell the jury that you fired the engine or threw three shovels of coal into it just immediately before the accident happened?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At that time, did you notice the injector working?

A. Yes, sir; the injector was working.

Q. Was that as much as a minute before the accident?

A. From the time I put the last fire in?

Q. Yes?

A. I just stepped down and took the shovel and throwed in about three shovelfuls and stepped up there and it happened.

Q. In estimating that by time, would you say it was as

[10] much as a minute before the accident, or how long would you say?

A. Well, just like you would step right out there and lean out.

Q. I want to get it in the record and I would like for you to fix it by the time, if you can.

A. It wouldn't take but a mighty short time.

By the Court:

Just approximate it; was it a minute or what?

Q. Was it ten or fifteen seconds or half a minute?

A. It wouldn't take much more than a second or two to step

from the door and lean out of the window, just like you would step from here on to this and lean over (indicating).

Q. The time it took you to do that, and at the expiration of that time I understood you to say the explosion occurred?

A. Yes, sir; as I leaned over.

Q. You say the water glass showed about that far, if I caught your correct measurement by your finger, from the top; what did you mean, about a half an inch from the top or what?

A. Yes, sir; something like a half an inch from the top of the glass of being full.

Q. How much water—or do you know how much water that would put over the crown-sheet?

A. I couldn't exactly tell, because I wasn't acquainted with that class of engine.

Q. Can you approximate it for us; I don't mean for you to be accurate, but can you approximate it in inches?

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the question because the witness has stated that he is not familiar with that class of engine.

By the Court:

You say you are not familiar with that class of engine, are you familiar enough with engines to approximate it?

Witness:

No, sir; I cannot say.

By Mr. Hunt:

Very well.

Q. Was the injector at Singer water tank working all right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the different sounds made by an injector when it is not working and when it is working?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want you to explain that to the jury, please.

A. How is that?

Q. I want you to tell the jury what kind of a sound an injector makes when it is not throwing water into the tank and what kind of sound it makes when it is throwing water into the boiler.

A. If it ain't putting water into the boiler, it will make a noise, a steam noise, and when it is putting water in it makes a solid sound, a gurgling sound.

Q. And you tell the jury at Singer station and at the time you

last fired a few seconds before the accident it was making this solid sound?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you making a nice smooth run on that day?

[12] A. Yes, sir; we were.

Q. Was there anything about the engine to suggest trouble at all, as far as you could see?

A. None at all that I know of.

Q. Did you have any delay on that trip at all?

A. None at all.

Q. Do you know when your engine or boiler, what pressure it was locked down to?

A. 180.

Q. Was it 180 or 185?

A. As well as I remember it was 180.

Q. Now, what do you mean; I want you to explain that to the court and jury, please, about the engine being locked down a certain number of pounds; what does that mean?

A. If we get over 180, if it is locked down to 180, there is a release valve that will pop off.

Q. Then the steam will go off when it reaches a higher pressure than that to which it is locked to?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the court and jury whether or not at this point, and at the point of the accident and at Singer tank and all along, you had a full head of steam?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the engine popping off at the point of accident?

[13] A. Yes, sir; it was.

Q. What was the first thing you knew when this accident occurred?

A. The first thing I knew when it occurred?

Q. Yes?

A. I don't understand you.

Q. As soon as the accident occurred, what did it do to you?

A. Just as soon as it occurred, it blew me out of the window, and the next thing I knew I lit on my face and breast.

Q. Have you any interest in this suit in any way on earth?

A. None at all.

Q. You have adjusted all of your differences with the Company, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. When it threw you out, was any water around there?

A. No, there wasn't none there; but it seemed like there was a good bit just before I left—it blew me out of there and my clothes were all wet.

Q. That is what I am trying to get at, whether your clothes were wet all over?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the water hot or cold?

A. It was pretty hot, the side it hit me on.

[14] Q. Did it scald you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were laid up for sometime, I believe, by reason of that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, how far below where you were thrown out was Mr Andrews thrown out?

A. It wasn't but just a few steps below me where he was at.

Q. Was he thrown out on the same side of the train that you were, or on the opposite side?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same side?

A. Yes, sir; the same side I was blown out of.

Q. In car lengths, about how far below were you?

A. I do not think it was hardly a car length; it did not seem to me like it was from where I could hear him.

Q. You mean further on?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the direction in which the train was going?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you could hear him and see him?

A. No, I couldn't see him, but I could hear him.

Q. Do you know how long he lived?

A. This happened at 10:20 and he lived until 11:55 the next day, I think.

Q. Where was the brakeman thrown out?

[15] A. He was thrown out over on the opposite side of the train.

Q. On which side of the track was the brakeman when the explosion occurred?

A. He was sitting on the left side, on my seat-box.

Q. With you?

A. He was sitting there by himself and I was standing right behind him; just stepped up behind him.

Q. And he was thrown out on the opposite side, you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far below where you were thrown out was he thrown out?

A. It seemed to me where I could hear him struggling it was just about like this, right across that way (indicating).

Q. What kind of a door was on that engine?

A. There was an air door.

Q. Do you know whether the door was blown open or not?

[16] A. No, sir; I cannot say; I never seen it.

Q. How much does that tank hold, do you know?

A. No, sir; I don't know its capacity.

Q. Do you know how many times the tank will fill the boiler?

A. I couldn't answer that question because I don't know for certain.

Q. Do you know whether the left injector was working at all that day?

A. No, sir; it was not.

Q. Was it put on at all?

A. No, sir.

Q. The left injector was on the side upon which you were located?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the left injector had been put on, would you have been bound to have seen it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you tell the jury that at no time up to the accident was the left injector put on?

A. No, sir; it was not.

Q. Now, Mr. Walton, will you tell the jury whether or not in firing you can see inside the fire box?

A. Yes, sir; you can.

[17] Q. Can you see the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir; you can see it by taking a little notice of it, but not all the time, we do not see it.

Q. In every spade of coal that you throw in do you see the crown sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. Tell the jury whether or not that crown-sheet was heated

to a red hot heat at the time of this accident?

A. No, sir; I cannot say.

Q. Mr. Walton, if a crown sheet is heated to a red heat will it make any different light in the fire box than when not heated—the difference between a blue and red appearance, I mean?

Defendant objected.

By the Court:

You may ask him about the general effect, not at this particular time, but the general effect of over-heating.

Defendant excepted.

A. I never did see one heated.

By the Court:

You are talking about the under side of that crown sheet?

By Mr. Staples:

Which is the top of the fire box.

Q. How is that fire box made with reference to the crown-sheet describe that to the jury?

A. I don't know as I could do that.

[18] Q. The best you can; I do not ask you to draw an accurate drawing of it.

A. How the fire box is made?

By Mr. Hunt, continuing:

Q. I will ask you this question: Was the crown sheet of that boiler so much within the range of your vision in firing the boiler that if it had been heated to a red heat that you would have been bound to have noticed it?

Q. Do you understand the question?

A. I couldn't say positively on that.

Q. Give us your best judgment on that?

Q. What do you say to that?

A. I suppose you would.

By Mr. Hall:

He answered that question once.

By the Court:

He said: "I could not say," and then a direct question was repeated to him, and he now says he suppose he could.

By Mr. Hall:

Well, we object to it.

Objection overruled. Defendant excepted.

A. You never gave me time to answer that question.

By Mr. Hall:

Wait a minute until the court makes a ruling.

By the Court:

Go ahead. Do you want to say anything further, Mr. Walton? You started to say something; go ahead and say it if you want to answer it.

A. I started to make an answer a little while ago and then you all objected to it and I never answered the question.

By the Court:

When either side objects you just stop talking.

Witness:

Yes, sir; I do.

By Mr. Hunt:

And after the court rules on it, then you can go on and finish your answer if the court says so.

Q. Now, then, to clarify the record upon this point, do I understand you to say that if the crown-sheet had been heated to a red heat it was so within your range of vision while firing the engine, that you think you would have been bound to have seen it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, will you tell the jury whether or not you saw any red crown-sheet?

A. No, sir; I did not.

[20] Q. Were you in a position to say about the amount of water that was thrown out of there, or do you know anything about that.

By the Court:

He asked him if he was in a position to tell, and he has not said whether he was or not. Were you in a position to approximate how much water was thrown out?

Witness:

No, sir.

Q. It didn't take you long to get away?

A. No, sir.

Q. In minutes, will you tell us how long it was, as near as you can, from the time that you looked at the water glass near Singer station until this accident?

A. It wasn't over three or four minutes.

Q. It was not over three or four minutes?

A. No, sir.

Q. Had you passed Singer water tank, or do you think you had passed it, when you looked at the water glass?

By Mr. Hunt:

Read the question.

(Question read to witness.)

A. Just about passing the tank, when I looked at, just about passing the tank, the last time I seen it.

Q. And that you think was three or four minutes before the accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had you fired for other engineers on the same class and kind of engine that this was?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell the court and jury how many injectors they worked on their runs?

A. Just one is all ever I knowed on that class of engine.

[22] Q. Will you tell the court and jury what kind of man Mr. Andrews was? I will get you to describe him to the jury so that the jury can get your estimate of the man.

A. He was a nice gentlemanly man in all respects, my best knowing of him.

Q. About what aged man was he?

A. I couldn't say about what age he was.

Q. Will you tell the jury whether or not he was recognized in railroad circles as a careful and painstaking man?

A. Yes, sir; he was.

By Mr. Hunt:

In regard to the question that was objected to a little while ago, while it has gone in, I will ask the court to withdraw that question and answer and ask the court to say to the jury that they need not consider it.

By Mr. Hall:

We object to that; he has asked the question and it has been answered, and the jury has got the benefit of it, and we object to it being withdrawn and stricken out.

By the Court:

I will let it stay in.

Q. I understood you to say that this injector had been working from the time you left the yard at Roanoke up to the time of the point of the accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell us whether or not the glass showed varying quantities of water?

A. Yes, sir; it did.

[23] Q. Will you state to the court and jury whether or not you gained water from the time you left Roanoke until you reached Singer tank, or lost water, as shown by the guage glass?

A. We gained water.

Q. Will you tell the court and jury as to the grade along there, which is the heaviest grade, from Roanoke to Singer tank or from Singer tank to the point of the accident?

A. It is a pretty heavy grade out of the yard to the Norfolk & Western overhead bridge, and there is a viaduct around there, and from there on to Singer it is about a gradual light grade, all right to pull, though.

Q. I mean the heaviest maximum grade, is the heaviest grade between Roanoke and Singer or between Singer and the point of the accident?

A. Between here and Singer is the heaviest pull.

Q. The heaviest pull is between the point of the accident and Singer then?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you first went to the engine that evening, was any one in charge of the engine?

A. Nobody but Mr. Andrews.

Q. Was there any hostler there?

A. None at all.

Q. There was no one except Mr. Andrews?

[24] A. That is all.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. This was your first trip on this engine, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it your first trip with Mr. Andrews as engineer?

A. Yes; on a through run it was.

Q. You say you left Roanoke about 8:45 p. m. that evening?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you got to the roundhouse Mr. Andrews was

[25] there in charge of his engine?

A. He was in the roundhouse when I got there, but he went out to the engine before I went out there.

Q. When you went on the engine Mr. Andrews was on the engine and in charge of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you did not see any hostler there?

A. No, sir.

Q. Isn't it a fact that the hostler turns the engine over to the engineer and leaves when the engineer comes and takes charge?

A. I suppose he does.

Q. Don't you know he does?

A. Yes; I know the engineer takes charge.

Q. It wasn't anything unusual then for you to find Mr. Andrews there in charge of his engine without a hostler on the engine with him, was it?

A. No, sir.

Q. You say it is the duty of the fireman to look after the

[26] water in the tank and see how much water is in the tank?

A. When you are taking the engine out of the roundhouse it is.

Q. And then it is the duty of the engineer to look out for the water in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The fireman has nothing to do with that?

A. No, sir.

Q. This water glass, I believe you say, is located over next to the engineer's side of the engine, isn't it?

A. It is on the right side of the engine; yes, sir.

Q. And it faces, so to speak, right where the engineer is

[27] sitting?

A. Most anybody can see it on the engine. It sets there so anybody on the engine mostly can see it, especially the fireman.

Q. Isn't there a flat side to this water glass into which you look to see whether there is water shown in the glass or not?

A. Of course the flat is facing you.

Q. And that is where you look to see whether there is water in the glass or not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That flat part?

A. To look at the water glass.

Q. That flat part of the glass faces the engineer, doesn't it?

A. Not particular, sometimes you find them that way and sometimes you do not.

Q. Sometimes you do not?

A. No, sir.

Q. If it did not face the engineer then he cannot sit on his seat-box and see it?

A. It is a mighty easy matter for him to turn around and see it; I have seen him do it.

Q. Isn't it a fact that the engineer always adjusts his water glass so that the flat part will be facing him, so that he can sit there and see it?

A. I guess I have seen him do that.

[28] Q. Don't they usually do that?

A. No, sir.

Q. How do they usually do?

A. If it is so that it is inconvenient for him, they generally take a wrench and turn it around; if it won't go around on the thread, why they leave it sit.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury whether this flat part of this glass was facing straight back to the rear of the engine or was it facing Mr. Andrews?

A. It wasn't facing him; it was just about like that (indicating), up on the boiler head, just like my two fingers there, it was only turned around like that (indicating), it wasn't turned around my side at all, it was on the boiler head, something like that (indicating).

Q. Wasn't the flat side facing him more than it was you?

A. Not as I noticed, it wasn't.

Q. Not as you noticed?

A. No, sir.

Q. You say that you watched this water glass pretty closely on that trip?

A. Going up the hills, all firemen do, mostly all do, that is his

business to look after the water and steam and fire; that is mostly their business, to pay attention to the glass.

Q. And you paid attention to it all the way on this trip up to Singer tank?

A. Pretty much all the way after we got over that overhead bridge.

Q. And you got over that?

[29] A. Yes, sir.

Q. You looked at it as you crossed the overhead bridge over the Norfolk & Western?

A. Yes, sir; I noticed it just before we came up to that.

Q. And then you did not look at it any more until you got to Singer tank?

A. No, sir; just going by there.

Q. And then you did not look at it any more until after the explosion occurred?

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. I mean you did not look at it between that time and when the explosion occurred?

A. No, sir.

Q. You say it was three or four minutes after you left Singer tank until the explosion occurred?

A. I would say it was about that time.

Q. About three or four minutes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know how far it was?

A. No, sir; I don't know; I couldn't say.

Q. You couldn't say?

A. No, sir; I positively could not.

Q. It was between three or four miles, wasn't it?

A. I don't know, I cannot say where the accident happened at, it was in the night.

Q. You don't know where the accident happened at?

[30] A. No, sir; I cannot say; no.

Q. And you say it was only three or four minutes from the time you left Singer tank until it did happen?

A. I gave that as an estimate, the best I could; that is the way the question was asked me.

Q. How fast was the train running?

A. I suppose it was running eighteen or twenty miles an hour.

Q. That is a pretty fast speed for that section of the road with a heavy freight train, isn't it?

A. It is nothing extra.

Q. Going up there?

A. Not along that part there.

Q. You were standing up at your seat-box on your knees with your head out of the window?

A. I just had leaned out there and had one knee on the seat-box when it happened.

Q. And you went out of that window?

A. It threw me out.

Q. On your side of the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the brakeman who was on that side of the engine with you the last time you saw him, he went out on the other side and fell on the right side of the track, didn't he?

A. Yes, sir; that is where I heard him at.

[31] Q. You heard him over there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Andrews, who was across on the right side, he came across on your side and went out?

A. I don't know how he got out of there.

Q. You know he was on your side?

A. That is where he was.

Q. He had to come across in front of that fire box in order to get over there, didn't he?

A. I couldn't say.

Q. Tell the jury how he would have gotten over there without crossing the platform there in front of the fire box?

A. I couldn't say in a case like that; I wasn't on there long enough to tell; I don't know how he came out of there or anything like that.

Q. You do know he was on your side?

A. I do know that they found him on that side.

Q. And there isn't any way you could tell the jury that he could have gotten over on that side without crossing in front of the engine box?

A. I cannot say anything about that, because I don't know what happened after it took effect.

Q. You don't know what happened?

A. No, sir; I cannot say how they got out of there or anything

about it.

Q. You did not turn on this left injector, did you?

A. No, sir.

[32] Q. And you did not see Mr. Andrews turn it on?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know anything about the window on the right side of the engine cab, do you, whether it was open or shut?

A. It was closed to my best remembrance.

Q. You say that the water glass at the time you looked at it at Singer tank showed water in it about one-half an inch from the top, was that your statement?

A. Yes, sir; I said just about that much (indicating).

Q. Didn't you afterwards say this, when Mr. Hunt asked you how much that was, that it was about half an inch?

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. You did not?

A. No, sir; I said something about like that (indicating).

Q. Well, what do you say now, was it a half an inch or an inch from the top?

A. I don't know; just about like that, you can use it as you want it.

By the Court:

Say about how much that is.

Witness:

That would be about half an inch from being at the top of the glass. I will say that.

Q. You did not say that before?

A. No, sir; I said it looked about that much.

Q. So I was mistaken in thinking that you said before that it was about half an inch from the top of the glass?

A. I suppose you were.

[33] Q. When you testified in this case before, how far did you say it was from the top of the glass?

A. I said about the same thing. That has been so long I do not exactly remember; I could not tell you.

Q. You said about the same thing, did you?

A. I suppose I did, I can't exactly tell.

Q. How long ago has it been?

A. Two years the 14th of this coming month.

Q. I mean when you made the previous statement in this case

as to how much water was in the glass?

A. It was last February.

Q. I will ask you if you did not make this statement at the last trial, when you testified in this case, speaking of the water glass: "I looked at it pretty often going out of here until we got to the Norfolk & Western bridge, where we crossed the Norfolk & Western up here, and it showed better than half full of water, and then I never paid any more attention to it until we got to Singer water tank, and when we got there the glass showed as being about an inch of beins to the top." Did you make that statement at the last trial?

A. I might have, I cannot remember whether I did or not. I want to tell the truth as near as I can, that is all I want to do.

Q. Now, you say you can tell when the injector is working?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell by the sound of the pipe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is that pipe located?

[34] A. It is located on the right side, if it is the injector o the right side that is working.

Q. Is it inside or outside of the cab?

A. It runs on the inside, I suppose; you can hear it.

Q. I don't ask you to suppose about it, Mr. Walton; you know about this engine, just tell the jury whether that pipe which you say you can hear the water in, is on the inside or outside of the cab?

A. It is on the inside of the cab.

Q. Where?

A. It is according to which injector is going.

Q. Where does it come inside the cab?

A. I don't know, I never pay much attention to it, but I know it is on the inside of the cab; I think it runs by the boiler head and over the top of the boiler.

Q. On the inside of the cab?

A. I think so.

Q. Are you sure of that?

A. I won't say for sure, but I am positive most; but I wont' say for sure.

Q. Where is the injector located?

A. It is on the inside of the cab on the boiler.

Q. In the boiler?

A. I never said in the boiler. I said it was on the inside of the cab on the boiler.

Q. On the boiler on the inside of the cab?

[35] A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is a thing that you can hear singing and throwing water into the engine?

A. I suppose so.

Q. You suppose so?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it don't make any difference whether the window is closed or open on the right side, you can hear the injector working and the water running through the pipe because it is right on the inside of the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you know whether or not an injector can work and not be putting any water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can it be in operation and no water be going into the boiler?

A. It could do such a thing.

Q. It could?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How could it do that?

A. If you turn it on and it don't catch it ain't putting no water in the boiler, but if you turn it on and it does catch, the water is going into the boiler.

Q. Where does the water go if it does not go into the boiler?

A. I don't know, but it just makes a steam or bubbling

[36] sound like.

Q. And what kind of a sound does it make when it is going into the boiler?

A. It makes a kind of a solid like sound, guggling.

Q. It makes a kind of a guggling sound then too?

A. Yes, sir; solid like.

Q. Who operates the injector?

A. The engineer is supposed to operate it.

Q. He has to work several valves in order to operate it?

A. I suppose he does.

Q. Do you know whether he does or not?

A. I know he works one, yes, sir.

Q. What valve does he work?

A. I never noticed any but one that puts the injector on.

Q. He only works one valve and you don't know what that is?

A. I wasn't familiar with them engines and I couldn't tell you.

Q. You weren't familiar with these engines and you couldn't tell?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know how many valves the engineer had to operate in order to put that injector to work?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you say that you are almost positive that the injector and the pipe leading from the injector into the boiler are on
[37] the inside of the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they are right on the engineer's side?

A. There is two of them, two sets of injectors on the engine.

Q. The right one is on the engineer's side inside of the cab, and the left one is on the fireman's side of the cab, right inside of the cab?

A. Yes, sir?

Q. That is right, isn't it?

A. I suppose it is.

Q. How is the injector put on?

A. I don't know. I never put these injectors on; I was not familiar with that engine and I never had anything to do with that; that wasn't my line of business.

Q. How do you know that neither Mr. Andrews nor anybody else put the left injector on?

A. Because I was on that side all of the time.

Q. But you don't know what they do to put it on, how do you know it wasn't put on?

A. I know it wasn't on; I know that much.

Q. How do you know?

A. Because I could have heard it if it had been on.

Q. You say you don't know how the injector is put on on this engine?

A. I did know, but I forgot.

Q. You don't know how many valves the engineer has to
[38] operate in order to put it on?

A. No, sir.

Q. How high are the doors to the fire box in that engine?

A. I don't know, I never did pay much attention to it.

Q. Give us some idea of it.

A. I have no idea.

Q. Can't you give us any idea?

A. No; I don't remember how high the doors were, I cannot

remember.

Q. The door opened right near the bottom of the platform, or the floor of the cab, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, can't you tell the jury how high that door is?

A. No, sir; I cannot.

Q. You cannot?

A. No, sir.

Q. You cannot give them any idea at all?

A. No, sir; I don't have no idea how high it is.

Q. You cannot tell them whether it is six feet high or two feet high?

A. You asked me how high it was; I don't know how high it was, but I know it is not six feet.

Q. When you are standing up there firing in front of that door is it as high as your knees, does it come up to your knees, the [39] top of the door?

A. I don't remember whether it does or not.

Q. You don't remember whether it does or not?

A. It might be higher than my knees and it might be lower, I don't remember.

Q. Do you think it is any higher than your knees?

A. I cannot say.

Q. Do you know whether it comes up as high as your waist or not?

A. No, it ain't that high I know.

Q. It isn't that high?

A. I do not suppose it is.

Q. So the nearest you can come to the height of that door is that it is somewhere between as high as your knees and as high as your waist, is that right?

A. How is that?

Q. That its height is somewhere between your knees and your waist?

A. I cannot say, it may be more than my knee and might be higher, I cannot say; it might be lower than my knee and might be higher, I cannot say; I don't know how high it is, I never measured it.

Q. Tell the jury how you see a crown-sheet in an engine; how can you look at it?

A. There is different ways to look at it.

Q. Tell them the different ways you can look at it.

A. If the engine is cool, you can stoop over and look up in there at it.

Q. If it is cool you can stoop over and look in there?

[40] A. Yes, sir; but when you are shoveling you have got to take the shovel and hold it up there to keep the heat off you.

Q. You cannot see it at all when the engine has fire in it without taking a shovel and holding it up in there and keeping the heat off you, can you?

A. I suppose you could with a light fire.

Q. With a light fire?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever try to look at a crown-sheet in an engine at any time with a fire in it without the shovel, to keep the heat off you?

A. I never did have any particular use to look in there to examine it with the fire in it.

Q. You never did?

A. No, sir.

Q. What kind of a fire did you have on this trip just before this explosion?

A. I just had an ordinary fire, just enough to keep the steam up in that shape.

Q. Does it take just an ordinary fire or a pretty hot fire to keep up 185 pounds pressure of steam when you are pulling an eighty-car train?

A. I had a pretty nice fire in that engine.

Q. You had a pretty nice fire?

[41] A. Yes, sir; I did.

Q. Now, did you get down on your knees and look into that fire box any time after you left Roanoke?

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Now, I want you to tell the jury whether you can see any part of the crown-sheet in one of those engines without getting down on your knees and putting your head into the door and looking up in there?

A. I never did look in one of these engines and I couldn't say. I never did examine the crown sheet in any of them.

Q. Now, Mr. Walton, when did you see that crown-sheet from the time you left Roanoke until this explosion occurred?

A. When did I see it?

Q. Yes?

A. From the time I left Roanoke?

Q. Yes?

A. The next place I seen it was over here in Roanoke in that courthouse.

Q. The next place you saw it was over in Roanoke in the courthouse?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you did not see that crown-sheet at all from the time you left Roanoke until this explosion occurred, did you?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you could not have seen that crown-sheet by looking into that door with the fire you had in there without getting down on your knees and putting your head in the door and holding the

[42] shovel up there so that you could look at it, could you?

A. I cannot say, because I never looked into one.

Q. Now, what is between the fire box, the place where the fire is, and the crown-sheet?

A. What is between?

Q. Yes what is between the grate where you kept your fire, and the crown-sheet?

A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know whether there is a brick arch in there or not?

A. There was supposed to be, but I don't know whether there was in this engine or not.

Q. You don't know whether there was one in this engine or not?

A. No, sir; I have forgot; I cannot remember.

Q. If that brick arch was in there, how far back does it extend to the door?

A. I do not remember; I cannot say. I do not remember whether there was a brick arch in this engine or not.

Q. You do not?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever see one of these engines operated without a brick arch in it?

A. I do not remember; that is what I was telling you, I

[43] was not familiar with them engines.

Q. And you don't know whether these engines like the one that exploded, had a brick arch in them or not?

A. No, sir; I cannot remember.

Q. Now, you have seen brick arches in some of the engines,

haven't you?

A. Yes, sir; not in this class engine, though, that I remember; I cannot remember whether these had it or not.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury whether that brick arch interferes with your seeing the crown-sheet or not?

A. To a certain extent it would in them old engines, but this one that blew up, I cannot tell you.

Q. To what extent would it interfere with your seeing the crown-sheet?

A. You couldn't see the back part of it, that is about all.

Q. You couldn't see the back part of it?

A. Yes, sir; next to the flues.

Q. You can see it if you get down and put your head inside the door, can't you look around the brick arch?

A. In the old engines I do not suppose you would have to do that.

Q. Wouldn't you have to put your head close to the door and look around the brick arch to see the crown-sheet?

A. Not in these old engines, you wouldn't have to lay down and stick your head in there to see.

Q. What kind of engines are you talking about?

[44] A. There are different class engines; you are talking about these new engines; I wasn't acquainted much with them, wasn't familiar with them.

Q. The engine that we are talking about is the engine that we want to know something about.

A. I cannot tell you about that arch in that engine, if that is what you want to know.

Q. All right, you say you cannot tell whether this engine has any brick arch in it or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. Can you tell the jury how close you had to put your head to the door in order to see that crown-sheet at all?

A. I said I couldn't tell whether there was any arch in that engine or not.

Q. If there wasn't an arch in there would you have to get down on your knees and put your head close to the door in order to see the crown-sheet?

A. I don't know. I never looked in this engine, not for any crown-sheet.

Q. Isn't it a fact that you never saw the crown-sheet in this engine in your life?

A. I seen it at Roanoke.

Q. I mean before the explosion occurred?

A. No, sir; not to my knowing.

Q. You never did see it in your life?

A. Not to my knowing; only at Roanoke.

Q. If you never say that crown-sheet in your life and did
[45] not see it on this trip, how can you say whether that crown-sheet was red hot at any time on this trip or not?

A. I never said it was red hot on this trip; I never said it wasn't.

Q. If you never saw it in your life and never saw it on this trip, you don't know whether it was red hot or not, do you?

A. If it was red hot I suppose a man would have noticed it.

Q. If there was a brick arch in there would that be red hot?

A. I don't know; I never seen an arch; I don't remember the arch in these engines.

Q. You have seen arches in other engines, when the engine is in operation, with a brick arch in there, is that red hot when the engine is running?

A. I don't remember, it has been so long since I was on one I cannot tell.

Q. Tell the jury how you would have been able to notice that this crown-sheet was red hot if you did not see it at all?

A. How is that?

Q. How would you have been able to notice that this crown-sheet was not red hot if you did not see it at all?

A. That would have drawed your attention to it, if it had been red hot, and if it had not been you would not pay no attention to it.

Q. How would it call your attention to it?

[46] A. You would have seen something wrong if you happened to glance in there and it happened to be red hot overhead, you know something is the matter.

Q. Isn't the brick arch always red hot when you have got one in the engine?

A. I couldn't say.

By the Court:

He said he did not know about that.

Q. You don't know about that?

A. No, sir; I don't know.

Q. If you don't know about that, then how are you going to tell how you would know if that crown-sheet was red hot?

A. It would draw your attention if you happened to be firing and look up there and it would be red hot up there, as red as it was at the bottom.

Q. In all the firing that you did on this trip you stood up and opened your door and threw your coal into your fire box and you never looked into that fire box at all except what you could see in throwing your coal in, did you?

A. You would be bound to look in every time you opened the door but you wouldn't notice overhead as much as you would down at the bottom.

Q. Could you see overhead at all when you were standing [47] up there throwing your coal into this fire box?

A. There wasn't anything to draw my attention to look overhead.

Q. Isn't it a fact that the only thing you could see when you were shoveling coal into the fire box was the fire in the box along on the grate, that is all you could see, wasn't it?

A. I never paid no attention to anything; I was firing that engine like an ordinary fireman would, looking after the firing.

Q. How did you open the door?

A. By air, by a pedal.

Q. You put your foot on a pivot or something and the door flies open?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you would stand up there and shovel your coal in?

A. Yes, sir; I was firing the engine.

Q. And all that you saw of the fire box was when you would open the door and throw your coal in, you could see in the fire box?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you did not look up at all?

A. No; nothing drawed my attention up to look.

Q. How high is the crown sheet above the grate of the fire box?

A. I don't know, I am no expert; I don't know anything [48] in the world about it.

Q. Have you got any idea?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never looked into one of these engines at all?

A. I never remember looking into this kind of an engine.

Q. You never saw the crown-sheet in one of those new engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. So you cannot tell the jury how high the crown-sheet is above the top of the door?

A. No, sir; I cannot.

Q. And you never fired an engine in your life with a crown-sheet that was red hot?

A. Not to my knowing, or no other man.

Q. Something generally happens when it gets hot, don't it?

A. I suppose it would.

Q. You never saw a fire box in your life open when the crown-sheet was red hot over that fire box?

A. No, sir; not to my knowing.

Q. How do you know then what kind of a light you would see from that red heat of the crown-sheet?

A. If you would be firing an engine along the road and it would be red over the top as it was down at the bottom you would be bound to notice it and you would think that something ought to be put in up there.

[49] Q. Suppose there was a red hot brick arch in there up over your fire box, would that look the same as a red hot crown-sheet or would it look different?

A. I don't know; I never did pay any attention to neither one, a red hot arch or anything.

Q. And you don't know whether the arch over the fire box gets red hot or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know what kind of a light it gives if it does get red hot, do you?

A. What was the question?

Q. You don't know what kind of a light a red hot brick arch over the fire box gives?

A. No; I never did pay any attention to it.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. I understood you to say that there was no difference in the glow in the fire box on that trip at any time up to the time of the accident?

A. None that I ever noticed.

(Witness stands aside.)

[50] F. A. RICHARDSON.

F. A. Richardson, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. What is your business?

A. An engineer.

Q. How long have you been an engineer?

A. Since 1907.

Q. Did you ever fire before you were an engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long did you fire?

A. Four years, about that.

Q. What company are you working for?

A. At present I am with the Virginian.

Q. How long have you been at work for the Virginian?

A. Five years, or a little over five years.

Q. You have been engineer for this defendant Company for five years?

A. Yes, sir; five years and two months.

Q. Are you familiar with the class of engine that was run, the crown-sheet of which exploded?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When Mr. Andrews was killed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever run one of those engines?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the injectors on them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know how to work them, I reckon?

[51] A. Yes, sir.

Q. You would be in trouble if you did not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In turning on the injector, do you turn it on from the inside of the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The injector is located where—below the cab, isn't it?

A. Just below the cab, between the engine and the tank.

Q. Is that known as a Sellers Non-Lifting Injector?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any trouble for the fireman to tell whether or not that injector is throwing water into the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any trouble about operating it?

A. No, sir; none whatever.

Q. If you have got your valves open and you have got on 185 pounds of steam on the engine, where is it bound to throw the water?

A. It will practically put it in the boiler.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. I mean that if the injector is working all right and properly primed, it will throw the water in the boiler.

Q. If the injector is in good working condition and properly primed and you have got the valve open, it is bound to put the water in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; if you have got the right amount of steam and
[53] water it is bound to thrown it in the boiler.

Q. That is what you call priming?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell from the difference in the sound whether the water is going in the boiler or not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You can sit in your cab with the windows shut and tell it, can you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you tell it when you were a fireman before you got to be engineer?

A. Yes, sir; that is the first thing a fireman learns.

Q. If in firing an engine, can a fireman in his act of stooping over to throw coal in, and in raking up the fire with his bar, can he see the crown-sheet or any part of it?

A. He can; yes, sir.

Q. If the crown-sheet was red hot will you tell the jury whether there would be a difference in the glow in that fire box?

A. It undoubtedly would; I never seen one red hot, but in my judgment—

By Mr. Hall:

(Interposing.) We object to that evidence and ask the court to strike it out.

By Mr. Hunt:

Did you finish your answer?

Witness:

I do not think I did.

Q. Well, finish it.

A. What was the question?

[54] Q. Read the question. (Question read to witness.)

A. There would be; undoubtedly there would be if the crown-sheet was hot. In addition to the fire you have in there you have also an arch and there would be an additional light there and heat to make it light.

Q. You have been running, I believe you said, this same type of engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recall when those engines first came on the line of the Virginian Railroad?

A. I do not believe I can; I never kept any record of them.

Q. I don't mean for you to give us the exact date, but do you know without telling the time, do you know when they came on the road?

A. No, sir; I couldn't say right now.

Q. Do you recall the fact that they were put on that line?

A. Yes, sir, indeed; they were put on our division—the third division they call it—when they first came here.

Q. And the time they came is that what you can't recall?

[55] A. No, I cannot recall that; I have got a record of it though.

Q. Will you state whether or not any of that same shipment of engines had a different type or kind of injector on it?

A. No, sir; not that I know of, or that I remember.

Q. Your answer is no to that question?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever run this particular engine?

A. I do not think I did ever run this engine.

Q. The engine that you ran was identical in every particular, wasn't it, or supposed to be?

A. Supposed to be; yes, sir.

Q. Now, I will ask you to state whether or not you know how many engines came on this yard or to the Virginian Railway in that shipment?

A. I do not know, but I think there was ten or twelve; I do not remember; I never paid any attention to the amount of them.

[56] (Manuscript page 56 marked out.)

[57] (Manuscript page 57 marked out.)

[58] (Manuscript page 58 marked out.)

[59] (Manuscript page 59 marked out.)

Q. Are you familiar with the grade on the Virginian Rail-
[60] road from Roanoke to the point of this accident?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. You said that when the valve of the injector is opened and properly primed with a pressure of 185 pounds of steam, it will throw the water into the boiler; what do you mean by the injector being properly primed?

A. We have an injector that has got to be properly primed before it will go to work.

Q. Who does the priming?

A. The engineer.

Q. What does it consist of?

A. When the injector primes?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. All we do is to open a little steam valve called a jet valve.

Q. And opening that valve correctly is what you call prim-
[61] ing the injector?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you don't open it correctly—

A. (Interposing.) It won't prime.

Q. Even though you may get it to the proper distances? I mean by that, you mean if it is opened wide enough, but if you don't open it right it will not prime?

A. No, sir.

Q. So when an injector is open it does not necessarily mean that water is going into the boiler?

A. No, sir; no, indeed.

Q. How many valves does the enginees have to open and manipulate to make that injector throw water into the boiler?

A. Do you mean on what kind of an injector?

Q. On the Sellers non-lifting injector?

A. Two; but this ain't got that priming valve I was telling you about.

Q. As a matter of fact, on the class of engine that is involved in this accident, doesn't he have to operate three valves?

A. Not on a non-lifting; no, sir.

Q. Only two?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that injector is not up on the boiler in the cab?

A. No, sir.

[62] Q. Is it down under the cab?

A. Yes, sir; right under the cab.

Q. On the outside?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that a fireman by listening can tell whether his injector is properly throwing water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It takes some experience to enable a man to do that, doesn't it?

A. It takes some little; yes, sir.

Q. A man who is not familiar with this class of engine and with this class of injector, could not tell at first whether his injector was working properly or not, could he?

A. Not right at first; he could not.

Q. He would have to acquire some familiarity with the engine and injector before he could tell whether it was working properly or not?

A. He certainly would.

Q. The fact that the window on the right hand side of the engine cab is shut, does that have any effect upon the hearing of the fireman and enabling him to tell whether or not the injector is properly working when the fireman is on the left hand side of the cab?

A. No, sir; it wouldn't hurt him, nothing of any conse-

[63] quence at all with the window shut; he don't get his sound from there.

Q. Where does he get his sound from?

A. It comes up from between the engine and the tank, so to speak; you see, from up under the engine like; you do not get any sound at all from out there; we do get a sound too, but that wouldn't have any great effect on it.

Q. Where does the pipe run that carries the water from the injector into the boiler?

A. It runs right up on top of the boiler.

Q. In the cab?

A. No, sir; outside of the cab, way ahead, at the head of the dome.

Q. It does not run through the cab?

A. No, sir.

Q. It runs outside the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And does it run low down outside the cab or high up?

A. It runs down underneath the cab, it misses the foot board of the cab.

Q. So it is underneath the platform or floor on which the fireman stands?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is not in the cab at all?

A. No, sir.

Q. I believe you said you never saw an engine being operated while the crown-sheet was hot?

A. I am speaking of this certain engine, about this pipe.

[64] Q. Yes, I am talking about that too.

A. We have engines with injectors in the cab, but I am speaking of this certain class of engine.

Q. On this class of engine the injector is under the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And outside of it?

A. The injector is down under the foot board of the cab and the feed pipe alslo is down there.

Q. I believe you said you never saw a crown-sheet being operated with fire under it when it was red hot?

A. No, sir.

Q. Or hot?

A. No, sir.

Q. So you can only conjecture how it would look?

A. I couldn't tell you how it would look, I just only suppose how it would look.

Q. How long would it stay hot that way and how long could you look at it red hot that way before it would come down?

A. It would depend on what you done to it.

Q. I will change the form of the question. I am asking you when an engine is being operated under the regular working pressure and when the crown-sheet was red hot and nothing is done to it, how long would it work that way?

[65] (Manuscript page 65 marked out.)

A. What is the question?

Q. Assuming that the engine is working at the regular
[66] pressure, and being worked in the regular manner of engines of this class, and the crown-sheet is red hot, how long will it work that way before the crown-sheet goes down?

A. I do not believe I could tell you.

Q. Would it not be a very short time?

A. I do not think anybody living could answer that question and tell how far it would go.

Q. Would it go for more than a minute?

A. Minutes, hours or days; no man living can tell how far that crown-sheet would go in that condition; a human being couldn't tell it; it may go an hour or two hours, it may not come down at all; no human being can tell about a crown-sheet in that way; no one can tell anything about it. That is the way I can give you an answer, and I do not believe that anybody else could tell you. They can surmise but they cannot tell how long it will go.

Q. Is there a brick arch in this class of engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is that arch?

A. It is just above the grates, commencing there and runs on an angle back to the back end of the fire box.

Q. And it is between the fire and the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that brick arch get red hot?

A. It undoubtedly does.

Q. Does it get white hot?

A. It depends on your fire; if you have got a good, nice fire it will get white hot; it changes as your fire does.

Q. With that arch red hot or white hot, how can you dis-
[67] tinguish the glow from the crown-sheet when the crown-sheet is also red hot?

A. Of course, that would have a tendency to have more light in the fire box; you see, by bringing this crown-sheet in with the brick arch and the fire in there would have a tendency to create more light undoubtedly.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. I don't know whether I have got you exactly clear or not, and I don't know whether the jury did, but I understand you to say that this brick arch in there would cover up the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir; I didn't say that.

Q. You did not mean to say that?

A. I did not say that.

Q. A man can look in the door notwithstanding the brick arch and see the naked crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the operation of the injector a simple or complicated proposition?

A. It is very simply; it is a non-lifting Sellers injector that we are talking about; we have some that are complicated, but not this injector.

Q. If, assuming that the injector was on from a point shortly after leaving the Roanoke yard and stayed on continuously and the, water glass showed a gain in water between those points, would
[68] that show conclusively that the injector was throwing water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. Can a fireman stand up in front of his door—that is, in front of the fire box door—and see the crown-sheet?

A. You mean standing up?

Q. Yes?

A. No, sir.

Q. What position does he have to get in to look at the crown-sheet?

A. You would have to stoop some.

Q. How much?

A. Considerable; it would depend on how tall he was.

Q. I mean a man of average height?

A. He would have to bend himself practically half way down.

Q. As a matter of fact, he would have to get on his knees, wouldn't he?

A. Not necessarily; no, sir; he would bend down something like this (indicating).

Q. You have got your head down on a level with your knees, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir; just about level with my knees.

Q. Does the heat disturb you in looking in that place?
[69] A. In a big heavy fire, it does; yes, sir.

Q. How do you usually go about looking at the crown-sheet and how do you protect yourself from the heat when you have

a hot fire?

A. Sometimes I hold my hand up like this (indicating), and sometimes I use a shovel. Sometimes I take a piece of waste in my hands and hold it like this (indicating), and as a general thing, I always take a look at that before going out when the fire is not so hot and you can see, as a general thing, the heat is not great.

Q. But to examine it when you have a good brisk fire you have got to protect yourself from it, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a man just pitching coal in couldn't see the crown-sheet, could he?

A. Not unless he would make an effort to see it; he could not see it by just pitching coal in.

(Witness stands aside.)

At this point, at the request of plaintiff, it is admitted by the defendant that this was an interstate train and that the plaintiff's intestate was engaged in interstate commerce at the time the explosion occurred.

It is admitted by both plaintiff and defendant that the plaintiff in this case has duly qualified as administratrix of the decedent.

Court takes a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

[70] TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1914—AFTERNOON SESSION.

Continuation of the evidence in chief on behalf of plaintiff.

MRS. MAUDE L. ANDREWS.

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You are the widow of Mr. Andrews who was killed in this accident on the Virginian Railroad on the 14th of November, 1912, I believe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long had you been married?

A. Seven years.

Q. How many children have you?

A. I have four.

Q. What are their ages?

A. Two, four, six, and eight.

Q. Your little boy that was with you in court, is that your oldest child?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mrs. Andrews, where were you married?

A. At Amherst courthouse.

Q. I believe you qualified as administratrix of your husband?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell the court and jury whether or not you had any other means of support other than the means furnished you by your husband's work?

Q. State whether or not your husband in his lifetime sup-
[71] ported you and your children?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What salary did he make?

A. He made between $170.00 and $200.00 a month.

Q. Was it so much a day or run?

A. I think so much a day.

Q. Do you recall the amount per day?

A. Between four dollars and five dollars a day, I think, as well as I remember.

Q. His profession was that of an engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, you may state what kind of a husband was he, so far as your children were concerned; was he loving, careful and painstaking husband for the welfare of his children, or not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state whether or not he was solicitous concerning his children, as to whether or not they should have an education?

A. Yes, sir; he was.

[72] Q. Have they any other means of support now other than such as you can give them?

Q. Mrs. Andrews, you may state what kind of a husband Mr. Andrews was and what kind of a father he was as to providing the comforts and necessities of home life?

A. He was a most kind father and loving husband; his first thoughts were of home.

By Mr. Wingfield:

We ask that the answer be stricken out as not responsive to the question, and as improper.

(Question withdrawn.)

Q. I will withdraw that question and ask another question and will also withdraw the answer as to the loving husband and ask that

the court will permit me to withdraw the same from the consideration of the jury.

By the Court:

The question that I allowed you to ask with reference to being an affectionate husband, do you want me to sustain that objection?

By Mr. Hunt:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Gentlemen of the jury, all those questions with reference to the fact of his being a loving and affectionate father, are withdrawn and you will not pay any attention to the questions and the answers of the witness; just blot them out.

Q. Now, I will ask you whether or not his earnings went to the support of his wife and children?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state whether or not from his earnings he cared for and took care of the necessaries and comforts of his home and family?

A. Yes, sir.

[74] Q. Now, I will ask you whether your husband at your home did things around the house which could only be done by him or some one else employed for that purpose?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the nature of the things which he did around the house with reference to repairing anything that was to be done or looking after the family or premises?

A. You mean his daily work?

Q. Yes?

A. He would help me with the children and he would just do anything that came to hand.

Q. Now, you may state whether or not he taught his children and instructed them in a literary way and a moral way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state whether or not he was with them at home and he was ready with his counsel and advise to his children and to his family?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the age of Mr. Andrews?

A. He was 38.

Q. When was he 38?

A. He was 38 in January before he died.

Q. And I believe you told us that his earning capacity per day was between four dollars and five dollars?

A. Yes, sir.

[75] Q. You said it ranged from $150.00 to $200.00 a month, was that dependent upon the number of days that he got in during the month?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If he got in a full month it ran up as much as $200.00, did it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that would make something over $6.00 a day, wouldn't it, Mrs. Andrews?

A. Yes, sir; it would.

Q. You may state whether or not he was industrious and ambitious, and a sober man?

A. Yes, sir; he was.

Q. Was he ever ready to answer the calls to go out on his runs when they were made?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mrs. Andrews, you testified in this case once before, when it was tried, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember what you said on that occasion as to how much your husband earned?

A. I said anywhere from $125.00 to $175.00 to $200.00, didn't I?

Q. And you say now from $150.00 to $200.00; why do [76] you make the difference?

A. Well, he did not always make the same.

Q. Sometimes he made as low as $125.00 a month, didn't he?

A. I suppose he did.

Q. What was the condition of Mr. Andrew's health?

A. It was very good at times; of course, occasioally he would lay off with sick headaches and things of that kind; he wasn't always the most healthful man.

Q. Didn't you say before that his health was poor and he lost a good deal of time on account of sickness?

A. I don't know that I did say that.

Q. Wasn't it a fact?

A. I won't say that he lost a good deal of time; perhaps he would lose a trip or two a month, or something like that, and it was on account of sickness more or less.

Q. Did you say his health was not good?

A. Not very.

Q. You had been married to Mr. Andrews seven years before this accident to him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many railroads had he worked for during that time as an engineer?

A. I don't know exactly.

Q. Where was he working when he was married to you?

By Mr. Hunt:

I do not see the relevancy of these questions.

[77] Q. Do you know where Mr. Andrews was employed when you married him?

A. He was running on the Atlantic Coast Line.

Q. Where did he go from the Atlantic Coast Line?

A. I think he went to the Norfolk & Western.

Q. Then where did he go from the Norfolk & Western?

A. To the Virginian.

Q. Didn't he go from the Atlantic Coast Line to the Louisville & Nashville?

A. Yes, sir; he did.

Q. How long was he employed there?

A. I couldn't tell you just how long.

Q. And then he went from the Louisville & Nashville to the Norfolk & Western?

A. Yes, sir; that is right.

Q. And from the Norfolk & Western to the Virginian?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So, during the seven years that you were married to him he was employed as an engineer on four different railroads; that is correct, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[78] ARTHUR SCRIVENOR.

Arthur Scrivenor, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. What is your business?

A. An engineer.

Q. Tell the jury what experience you have had; what line of work you have been engaged in that brings you in touch with locomotive boilers and kindred questions?

A. When I first left school I went to the Barrow Hematite Steam & Iron Works in Lancashire, England, where I was employed in firing boilers, and gas producers. From there I went to North Greenwich where they had an experimental station, firing boilers with coal and with oil; they had about seven or eight boilers there; and from there I went to the Unity Iron Works, and from there I came to this country and I was employed at the American Locomotive Works, then the Richmond Locomotive Works, in the drawing office, and in 1893, I went into business for myself doing engineering work, and for several years I have been occupied in what is called power plant work; familiar with the stationary boilers particularly, and had a good deal to do with boilers and engines, electrical apparatus and things of that kind. In that time I had charge of manufacturing plants, foundry work and machine shops and so forth.

Q. Have you examined the crown-sheet over there in this case?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

I do not think the witness has qualified as an expert on locomotive boilers, and I would like to ask him a few questions along that line.

By the Court:

Very well.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What experience have you had with locomotive boilers, Mr. Scrivenor?

A. You mean in running locomotive boilers?

Q. No; I mean in knowing anything about them?

A. Only while I was in the locomotive works and what I have seen with my eyes at other times since, and what I have read about them.

Q. You were a draftsman in the office of the locomotive [79] works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers?

A. Except to go to the shop and see how things were carried out and that they were carried out.

Q. To see that they were constructed according to the plans you drew?

A. Yes, sir; I mean going in and getting the details, and I was brought in touch with the work going on in the shop. I do not mean to say we were put in the place of the foremen, because we were not.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers actual boiler work?

A. No, sir.

Q. And your experience in connection with locomotive engines or repairing locomotive engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you experience in connection with locomotive [80] engines ended in 1893?

A. Any practical experience that I had with them; yes sir.

Q. How long were you in the drafting room in the Richmond Locomotive Works?

A. From December, 1891, until they closed in 1893, I have forgotten the month.

By Mr. Hall:

That is all I desire to ask the witness, but we think the witness is clearly incompetent to testify as to locomotive boilers.

By Mr. Staples:

We think he is qualified to speak as to that.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. I will ask you whether or not in your work in the locomotive works at Richmond you were necessarily brought in contact with the actual manufacture and building of boilers?

A. Yes, sir; I saw them built every day I was there.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What kind of locomotives were built in 1893?

A. You mean what types?

Q. Yes?

A. They were older types than are built today.

Q. They were entirely different types of engine?

A. Very much different. The first radial stay fire box, I think, was built at the Richmond Locomotive Works while I was there, and it was designed by the master mechanic of the C. & O. Railroad.

Q. And the types of locomotive engine in their size and
[81] the kind of crown-sheets and stay-bolts have entirely changed since 1893?

A. I do not think the kind of crown-sheet and the kind of stay-bolts have changed very much since the radial stays and radial crown-sheets were started, but I think the type of locomotive has changed a great deal.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Scrivenor, did the work that you have done require knowledge of the principles which would be applicable in determining from an inspection of a crown-sheet of an exploded locomotive, a failed crown-sheet, as to the cause of the failure?

Defendant objected.

By the Court:

Ask him what experience he has had to enable him to determine that.

Defendant excepted.

A. Ask that question again, please.

Q. (The question is read to the witness.)

A. You use the word "require", I cannot say my work has required that knowledge, but one acquires that knowledge by pursuing that work.

Q. Do you think you are familiar with those principles of mechanics and physics which would be involved in determining that?

A. I think so.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

[82] Q. Mr. Scrivenor, have you examined the crown-sheet in this case, lying over there in view of the jury?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Court:

I suppose it is admitted that that is the crown-sheet?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir; that is the crown-sheet.

By Mr. Staples:

The defendant produced this crown-sheet as the crown-sheet that was blown down when the explosion occurred and when Mr. Andrews was killed.

By Mr. Hall:

We object, if your Honor please, to the witness answering any questions with reference to this crown-sheet as an expert witness on the ground that he has not shown himself qualified to answer as an expert witenss.

By the Court:

That is to save making any exceptions hereafter?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Just note the objection and objection overruled.

By Mr. Hall:

I want to ask one question. Have you ever examined a crown-sheet of a locomotive that failed from low water?

Witness:

No, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Did you ever see one in your life before you saw this crown-sheet that had failed and was buckled down as this crown-sheet is?

Witness:

I didn't catch that, please read it.

(Question read to witness.)

A. Not unless I saw it on a scrap heap. I mean I may
[83] have seen one but I cannot say definitely at any particular place that I did see one.

Q. You cannot say definitely that you ever saw a crown-sheet in your life that was blown out on account of low water?

A. I cannot say it was blown out on account of low water.

Q. Can you say that you ever saw a crown-sheet blown out in any way in an explosion of an engine?

A. I did not see the explosion, but I have seen damaged engines and damaged fire boxes.

Q. I asked you about locomotive engines.

A. I am speaking of locomotives.

Q. You do not know whether any of them were damaged by an explosion caused by low water or not?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Has your experience made you familiar, that is, your experience and study, made you familiar with the effect upon iron of heat, that is, the effect upon its holding power, and the effect upon its appearance?

A. I have had considerable experience from its appear [84] ance.

Q. Have you made a considerable study of the effect of heat upon its holding power?

A. To some extent.

Q. Have you examined the crown-sheet in this case?

A. Yes, sir; I have examined it as well as I could.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the appearance of that crown-sheet shows anything that would necessarily indicate that the explosion was caused by low water?

A. I do not think that the appearance of the crown-sheet itself is positive proof that there was low water.

Q. Do you think that there is anything that necessarily indicates that at all from the appearance of the crown-sheet?

A. What might have been low water might have been other things too.

Q. In other words, it might have been low water or it might have been caused from other things, is that what you mean?

A. That is my opinion.

Q. When you say low water you mean absence of water over the crown-sheet at the time it failed, don't you?

A. That is what I understand is meant by it.

Q. If the sheet had been white hot at the time of the failure would it have had the color and appearance that it now has?

A. I do not think it would.

Q. What would have been the color in your opinion?

A. A brownish red.

Q. What would have been the appearance of the surface, that is, as to smoothness or roughness?

A. I think the surface would have been rougher than it is.

Q. Do you or not think that if the sheet had ever been white hot that the surface could have been brought to its present condition without special treatment?

A. I do not think it could have been without special treat-
[86] ment, because it would have had a coating of oxide of iron which would require a reduction in order to produce a blue color.

Q. How hot could the sheet have been and retain its present appearance?

A. I couldn't say definitely, as I have no records of my own covering that point.

Q. From your study of the subject?

A. I will state that I have read in "Treatise on Heat" and such things, that I should say a Fahrenheit heat from 1000 to 1200 degrees.

Q. If that crown-sheet is supported by one and one-eighth inch button head bolts, what would you think would have been the holding power of those bolts if they had been in perfect condition at dull red heat, the pound pressure, that they could have withstood?

Defendant objected.

By Mr. Staples:

We call on the defendant now to produce the bolts.

By the Court:

I understood that they were produced at the same time that they produced the crown sheet.

Q. What material do you call this; have you any name for it wrought iron or steel, or what is it—Mr. Slayton?

By Mr. Slayton:

Special stay-bolt iron, fibrous wrought iron.

[87] Q. I will predicate my question then upon that bolt being made of fibrous wrought iron or special stay-bolt iron.

By Mr. Wingfield:

I would like to ask the witness a question before he answers the one asked by Mr. Staples.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. Isn't stay-bolt iron of varying qualities, or various degrees of fineness and various degrees of tensile strength and toughness?

A. Yes, sir; I would say it would be; it would depend who manufactured it and what they made it out of.

By Mr. Staples:

I am talking about first-class material.

889

A. I have not made any definite tests as to the holding power of a red hot bolt myself, but according to Kent, who is considered an authority, I see it on the table here, I have it myself the best Lancashire iron which is considered first-class fibrous iron on the other side, it is supposed to increase its strength up to a temperature up to 500 or 600 degrees and then lose its strength down to a limit—I think Kent says something like seven or eight thousand pounds, that is, per square inch. I know that is bright red heat, dull red heat; it would be safe to say it would stand seven thousand pounds.

Q. Is it or not true that at a dull red heat that a bolt should stand somewhere in the neighborhood about half of what it should stand under water of four hundred or five hundred degrees?

A. It might be a little less than that.

[88] Q. If the stay-bolts in this engine were stays four by four with these button-head bolts, what would be the pressure upon each bolt when the steam in the boiler was up at popping-off point or its maximum?

A. What was the steam pressure?

Q. 185 pounds.

A. 185 pounds multiplied by 16.

Q. That would be 2960, wouldn't it?

A. I don't know; you can figure it.

Q. I wish you would multiply that so you can answer the question?

A. 2960.

Q. Do you, or not, think there would be any doubt about the ability of those bolts to stand ordinary boiler pressure at a dull red heat?

A. I do not know about those bolts.

Q. I mean if in good condition; I am assuming that they were in good condition.

A. I would say that iron would stand it, or good iron.

Q. If the bolts are composed of first-class iron?

A. That is what I mean.

Q. If that is the case, do you think there would be any doubt about their ability to withstand that pressure, assuming that everything was in good condition and that the material was first-class, at a dull red heat?

A. I should think so, but my thinking is simply based on

[89] the figures I gave you just now.

Q. What would be the pressure that they would have at

the maximum pressure of the boiler?

A. They would have 3000 pounds on each bolt.

Q. And they should withstand what?

A. At least twice that.

Q. Now, if heated to a red hot, what do you think those bolts should withstand, what pressurs?

A. What do you mean, a bright red heat or what red heat?

Q. Yes, a bright red heat.

A. It would be less than at a dull red heat.

Q. How much less do you think?

A. Say about four or five thousand pounds per square inch.

Q. Your opinion there then is predicated upon the idea that the material is first-class and all of the bolts are in good condition?

A. I regarded the strength given of first-class iron of that diameter or that area.

Q. Assuming, as I have stated, that everything was in first-class condition?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Scrivenor, I wish you would look at that crown-sheet and tell the jury which side of it was the side next to the water and which side was the side next to the fire?

[90] A. I think this was the side next to the water.

Q. And the other side was the side next to the fire in the fire box?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why do you think that?

A. Because the pressure is on this side.

Q. Is there any other way you can tell?

A. The other side is slightly discolored.

Q. What discolored it?

A. The heat.

Q. Did it have any water on it when the heat discolored it that way?

A. I couldn't tell you whether it did or not, possibly it did not.

Q. It did not?

A. Possibly.

Q. Can you look at that crown-sheet and tell the jury whether or not it ever had fire under it with no water on top of it? In other words, whether it was ever burned in the common parlance among

boiler makers?

A. I have never seen a boiler, just one exactly that same color with water on the top. That must be my reply, because I cannot say that I ever saw a sheet that I positively knew there was no water on the top.

Q. Do you know what the indications are of a burned crown-sheet?

A. Of a burned crown-sheet?

[91] Q. Yes?

A. Scale, for one thing.

Q. What kind of scale?

A. It depends on the temperature at which the metal was burned.

Q. Where do you see that scale, which side of the crown-sheet does that scale appear on?

A. I am speaking of the oxide of iron on the face of the crown-sheet, the fire side.

Q. What color does a burned crown-sheet have then?

A. If it only gets a small quantity of oxygen and a small quantity of air in contract with it, it may be blue; if very highly heated and gets very much air in contact with it it will be red.

Q. I want to hand you a bolt head and ask you whether you think that was ever burned or not, that is, heated to a red hot heat?

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to that question because we do not know what bolts they are.

A. It certainly was when it was made in the first place.

Q. Suppose this head is off a bolt like this, that had a perfectly square shoulder like that, when it was put into the crown-sheet. Now I want to ask you whether or not that bolt head shows that it was ever heated after it was put into the crown-sheet?

A. It certainly had indications that it was, by its shape

[92] Q. To what extent was it heated in order to have taken that shape?

A. I do not know to what extent it was.

Q. Cannot you give us any idea what degree of heat it was? You have been telling about the different degrees of heat, what effect they have on iron. Now, tell us about what degree of heat that bolt was heated to be put in that shape if it was in the crown-sheet?

A. I should say by the color of that bolt that it was heated to a dull red heat.

Q. To a dull red heat?

A. Yes; that head.

Q. What holding power would it have at a dull red heat?

A. The head or the bolt?

Q. The bolt. In other words, what strain would have been necessary to break that bolt off, if it was broken off, if it was heated to a dull red heat?

By Mr. Staples:

I object to that question because a bolt will stand more pressure if it is a good bolt than a sorry one.

By Mr. Hall:

I will let Mr. Scrivenor answer the question both ways.

Q. You can assume it was a good bolt or a sorry bolt.

A. I cannot tell what pressure it would have broken at. I do not know what the condition inside that head was at the time, I mean the fibrous structure.

Q. Assuming that it was good, what strain would have [93] been required to break it at a dull red heat?

A. According to what information I have, the strain would have been, as I said just now, about seven or eight thousand pounds.

Q. It would have stood fifty per cent of the original strain at a dull red heat?

A. That is a dead straight pull.

Q. If that bolt head was forced in that position by the crown sheet, and I will show you this one, I want you to tell the jury what shape that crown-sheet would have been in when that bolt head took that position. Assuming that the bolt head was originally square there as this one is.

A. I would say that if that bolt head was square with the bolt, that when that metal actually and finally parted that crown-sheet was not in its original position.

Q. What shape was it in?

A. I cannot say what shape it was in, but it was certainly on askew.

Q. In askew all around the bolt?

A. No, sir.

Q. What part of it shows it was not in askew?

A. It appears to me to have been upset, like that (indicating), when it parted.

Q. What do you mean by saying it appears to be upset like that?

A. I mean the whole sheet was at that angle when that head finally parted from the bolt, because that bolt appears to be pointing down in this direction (indicating). To me the angle at
[94] which that sheet lay in relation to the axis of the bolt was as that finger is to that hand there (indicating).

Q. Was the sheet bent around or curved down as the bolt head is?

A. I don't know whether it was or not.

Q. How could the bolt head have gotten in that shape if it was not bent down?

A. Oh, if the sheet wasn't bent down?

Q. Yes?

A. It could not unless the bolt had not been flat on the sheet at first.

Q. It could not unless the bolt head had not been flat on the sheet at first?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did not the sheet necessarily take the shape that that bolt head has got at a time when the bolt head was hot, in order for the bolt head to have that appearance?

A. Are you referring to the angle made by that head, or just the curve of the head?

Q. No, sir; I am referring to the slope.

A. Of the head itself?

Q. Of the convex shape of the head itself, as differing from the shape, the straight shape it has got on this perfect bolt.

A. Yes, sir; I think it did.

[95] Q. You think the sheet around that bolt had the same shape it has got?

A. Approximately.

Q. Didn't it have to have the same shape in order to force the bolt head in that shape?

A. No, I think you could work it out some way by which the sheet would roll up one way or have a continuing motion, but I do not think it did; that is a possibility; I think it is more likely the sheet was in approximately that shape at that point.

Q. Did you ever see an engine that had a burned crown-sheet that had not failed; I mean a locomotive engine that had a burned crown-sheet that had not failed?

A. No, not a locomotive.

Q. You would not know how to tell whether a locomotive had a burned crown-sheet or not, would you?

A. I think so.

Q. How?

A. I should say partly by the color and partly if there was any bagging, there might be some slight bagging between the bolts.

Q. Could it be burned slightly and not bagged?

A. Superficially.

Q. Did you ever see one burned slightly that did not bag?

A. You mean a locomotive?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. I just said I never saw a locomotive crown-sheet [96] burned.

Q. Is there any other way you could tell whether a crown sheet was burned, except by bagging and the color?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, can you go over there and look at that crown-sheet and tell the jury whether there is any bagging there that indicates whether it was burned or not at any time in its history?

A. At this top corner of this end, there is some indication of slight bagging between the bolts.

Q. Just at one corner of it?

A. I didn't notice it at any other corner.

Q. Suppose you go over and take a good look at it and come back and tell us whether there is any sign of that crown-sheet having been burned at any time or not.

(Witness examines the crown sheet.)

A. As I said before, the spaces in between the bolts at this particular corner show indications of some bagging or more bagging than they do at any other point on the crown-sheet between the bolts

Q. Isn't there some bagging between the bolts at all points on the crown-sheet?

A. There is slightly.

Q. And there is some bagging at this corner?

A. It appears to be so.

[97] Q. How do you explain to the jury that bagging?

A. At the corner?

Q. All over it; the bagging that you say you find there, what caused it?

A. I would say it was one of two things, either that the plate became heated, which I said I did not think it became hot enough to bag like that, therefore it is my opinion that some of the bolts had

been broken previously and that the sheet was not in condition to sustain the pressure, and possibly more bolts may have broken at that time and finally it gave way.

Q. I wish you would go back and answer my question. It is a very simple question; and tell the jury how that bagging which you have just stated is on that sheet, was caused?

A. The initial bagging between those small bolts?

Q. Yes?

A. That may have been caused by a hot sheet.

Q. Now, you say it may have been caused by a hot sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know any other way it could have been caused except by a hot sheet?

A. No, sir; I do not know any other way, up in that corner.

Q. How about the bagging at other places on it, do you know any other way that could have been caused except that the sheet was hot?

A. That may have been caused when the sheet was cold [98] after the bolts gave way.

Q. The bagging between the bolts?

A. No; I did not say the bagging between the bolts; that is very slight; I am speaking of the whole bagging.

Q. I am talking about the bagging between the bolts. I understood you to say that in a certain corner of it that there is more bagging than there is elsewhere; that all over the sheet there is a certain amount of bagging between the bolts. Now, confining yourself strictly to that bagging between the bolts, I want you to tell the jury how else that could have been caused except by the sheet being burned?

A. I think that the bagging between some of the bolts could have been caused by simply some of the bolt heads holding the sheet back while the rest of the sheet was going forward.

Q. I want you to take any four bolts there now that you can find and explain to the jury how the bagging between those four bolts could have been caused in any other way except when the sheet was hot?

A. I do not think that it could have been—you take it between any four bolts?

Q. Isn't there bagging between every four bolt heads on that sheet?

A. I haven't tried it with a level or anything of that kind.

Q. Can't you see it with the eye?

A. There appears to be a slight bagging; yes, sir.

[99] Q. Between every four bolt heads on that sheet, and you say you do not think it could have been caused in any other way except when the sheet was hot, is that correct?

A. I did say that—slight bagging between any four bolts.

Q. Now, could that sheet have been hot and that bagging have been caused without water on top of it?

A. Only if there was oil or scale on top of it, it can then.

Q. What position does the sheet set in the engine or boiler?

A. Fore and after?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. This is the foreward end.

Q. Is it horizontal or does it slope?

A. I think there was a slight slope; it differs in different engines, I think.

Q. So then, in order for that bagging to have been caused when the sheet had water on top of it, it must have had oil over the whole top of that sheet—oil or scale over the whole top of that sheet?

A. I said if there was oil.

Q. Yes?

A. Ask the question again, please.

Q. My question is this: If the bagging that is in that sheet occurred with water on top of it, then it must have had oil or scale over the entire top of the surface of that sheet?

[100] A. I cannot say that is true, because I have seen photographs of boiler plates which were bagged locally, and the cause of the bagging was attributed to oil on the inside surface of the plate, and those baggings were oval in shape.

Q. They only bagged where the oil was on the plate?

A. Presumably.

Q. My question is this: that if this sheet was bagged in that way, that is, from having oil on it, then it had oil all over the entire surface?

A. Is that the entire surface of the crown-sheet?

Q. I mean the entire surface of that part of the crown-sheet.

A. No; I do not say that would be necessarily so.

Q. How could that bagging have been caused between each one o fthe four bolt holes without oil on it, as you have said, unless it did not have water on it?

A. I did not say it could. You asked me to tell the jury if there was any other possible way in which the plate could get hot with water on it, and I said possibly with oil, or possibly with scale; I did not say there was oil on it.

POOR COPY

Q. Have you ever seen one that did get hot and bagged becau it had oil or scale on it?

A. I have not actually seen the plate itself, but I ha
[101] seen photographs of the plate.

Q. What form was the plate?

A. It was exactly if it had been depressed, or you might s a semi-egg shape with slight flanging off where the curve starts.

Q. What part of the sheet did that take places, that bagging

A. At the bottom nearest the fire, longitudinal of the boiler.

Q. And nearest the fire?

A. Right over the fire.

Q. And it did not extend over any part of the sheet; I mean say, it was just a local place there?

A. I did not measure it because I did not measure the pho graph of the boiler; but judging from the length of the boiler, it w probably eighteen feet, which is the average length of 150 horse pow boiler; that is the type of boiler it was, and I would say it was eig teen inches long, one of them; there were two or three of them on t same sheet.

Q. That sheet was sloping, wasn't it?

A. The slope of a boiler, if properly set—the boiler I am spea ing of is one inch in eighteen feet.

Q. And the oil was at the lowest point?

A. No; it was at the higher end of the boiler; it was on t forward end of a horizontal return tubular boiler, and that end is inch higher than the back end; some people set them t
[102] inches higher.

Q. Your sheet was curved, wasn't it?

A. Certainly; it was a circular sheet.

Q. Where was it, at the highest point of the circle or the low point?

A. The lowest point of the circle, my recollection is there w three of them; I am sure there were two, one was approximately the lowest point, and the other one by the side of it.

Q. Do you find any indication of oil or scale on this sheet have caused the bagging?

A. I do not see any.

Q. You would see them if they had caused it, wouldn't you?

A. I don't know that I would; I never examined inside of boiler while it was being bagged; it is an impossibility to see wh indications are inside of a boiler at the time of the bagging.

Q. You never saw one and you don't know?

COPY BOUND CL

A. No; and I don't think anybody else has, while it was being agged, but afterwards they have.

Q. I suppose plenty of other people have seen them immediately after they were bagged?

A. I have no doubt they have.

Q. They could tell then?

A. They might; I don't know whether any indications were left y the oil or not.

Q. You don't know anything about it except having
[103] heard that that might be so, and having seen these photographs; you don't know anything about it except that?

A. About what?

Q. About the bagging of boilers by having oil on them?

A. Since I have been doing a good deal of work in trying to ounteract that for people for the last four years, I do know a little it about it, by filtering water and putting in apparatus to counteract he oil.

Q. Where does the oil come from?

A. The exhaust steam from engines—stationary engines, I am peaking of, of course.

Q. You wouldn't have any such condition as that in a locomotive?

A. Not unless you used your exhaust steam to carry it back nder the tank, and I do not know whether they did or not.

Q. Did you ever see a locomotive that did that?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never heard of that?

A. I don't know what a locomotive does with the exhaust steam except what goes up through the stack; they do use some for heating but I don't know whether any goes into the tank or not.

Q. Will you look at that bolt head and tell how hot it was?

A. Only as I did before. (Witness examines same.) Do you mean when it broke or when it was made?

Q. I mean when it was broken or when it was last heated
[104] A. I don't know.

By Mr. Staples:

Is that also one of the bolts that came out of this engine?

By Mr. Hall:

No; but I want to test the accuracy of his knowledge as to what he can tell from the appearance of a bolt.

OSE IN CENTER

By the Court:

Keep the bolts separate.

By Mr. Hall:

They are all marked.

A. My answer was I did not know what temperature it was at which it broke.

Q. Can't you tell the jury whether it was a red heat, a cherry red or a white heat?

A. No, sir; because it may have been a cherry red or a white heat before it broke and broken afterward. What I mean is: the color itself is no indication of the strain at which it broke.

Q. All right. I will put the question to you this way: Suppose that bolt was broken when it was hot, and that it has not been heated since it was broken, tell us how hot it was.

A. Or before?

Q. Yes?

A. I couldn't tell you, because it might have been heated to a high heat before then.

Q. You mean in forging it?

A. I do, or for any other reason.

[105] Q. What is the difference between the temperature of those two bolt heads, to which they were heated?

A. I do not know that there is any difference between the two one appears to have a little more scale on it than the other.

Q. Which one?

A. This one (indicating).

Q. What does that indicate?

A. Simply the conditions under which it was heated, and I do not know what they were.

Q. How do you know it indicates the conditions if you don't know what they were?

A. I mean I do not know what the conditions were under which that bolt was heated.

Q. Which one of those bolts appears to have been heated to the highest degree of temperature, the conditions being the same in both cases?

A. Except the temperature?

Q. Yes?

A. I would think this one had.

Q. Why?

A. From its appearance, roughness.

Q. You mean the one that has got the nut on the end of it is the one you think was heated the hottest?

A. I do not say it was; I say it has some indications that might lead you to think it had happened. It would not lead me to think it was forged at a lower heat or had been subjected to a lower heat.

[106] Q. At what degre of temperature did I understand you to say that fibrous wrought iron would retain 50 per cent of its strength?

A. I don't think I said that.

Q. Or somewhere in that neighborhood?

A. About 1000, I think that is what I said.

Q. At a red heat?

A. That is a dull red heat.

Q. When you referred to Kent and said according to Kent that iron got stronger up to about 500 degrees and then from that time on it lost its strength, was that right?

A. Yes, sir; I think so.

Q. Now, Kent lays down on page 454 that a dull red heat is 700 degrees Centigrade or 1292 Fahrenheit, doesn't he?

A. I don't know the exact figure; I think I said 1000 to 1200 is my recollection.

Q. I will ask you to look at that book and see if Kent does not say on page 454 that a dull red heat is 1292 degrees Fahrenheit?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I will ask you if Kent does not say on page 383 that at 1300 degrees Fahrenheit fibrous wrought iron only has a tensile strength of 16.5 per cent of its original strength when cold?

A. The original strength being what—13 per cent. I think Kent also gives the original strength per square inch for a fibrous bolt of 46,000 pounds; 13 per cent of that would be approxi-

[107] mately about 6000 pounds.

Q. I don't care what kind of bolts you take; I asked you the simple question if Kent does not lay it down on page 383 of the work that you have referred to that at 1300 degrees temperature Fahrenheit, that fibrous wrought iron only had 16.5 per cent of its original strength, when cold?

A. It says 16½ per cent for 1300 degrees.

Q. That is the strength it has?

A. That is what it says here.

Q. Now, at a dull red heat, which Kent lays down as 1292 degrees, it would only have about 16.5 per cent of its original strength, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir; according to that table.

Q. Suppose it was a cherry red, Kent says on page 454 that the degree of temperature would be 1652 degrees, doesn't he?

A. Cherry red heat, 1652.

Q. I would like for you to look at the table on page 383 and tell what percentage of its tensile strength it would have at a cherry red heat?

A. 7 per cent it says here.

Q. Only 7 per cent?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What figure was that you gave awhile ago as to the percentage of strength that it had when it was heated to a dull red heat?

A. 10 to 12, I think I said.

[108] Q. 10 per cent to 12 per cent?

A. No; that was the degree of temperature; I think I said about six or seven thousand, at dull red heat.

Q. I am not asking you about any particular bolt—how much any particular bolt will hold—but I wont to know if you did not make the statement awhile ago when you were being examined by counsel for the plaintiff that iron heated to a dull red heat had a certain percentage of its original strength?

A. I do not recollect the question exactly that way.

By Mr. Hunt:

He gave it in pounds instead of percentage.

By Mr. Hall:

He gave it both ways, I think. Didn't you?

A. No; I really do not remember that; it may be so, but I do not remember it.

Q. I may be mistaken about that, but the fact is when you heat it up to a dull red heat it only has 16½ per cent of its original strength?

A. According to that table; yes, sir.

Q. If you heat it up to a cherry red heat it only has 7 per cent of its original strength?

A. According to that table; yes.

Q. You do not dispute the correctness of that table, do you?

A. I have no better one.

Q. You think that is right?

[109] A. Simply because I have made no tests myself. Others have made tests possibly that I have not seen and they may

give different degrees.

Q. So, when a bolt gets heated up to a dull red heat, it has lost considerable of its strength, hasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; it certainly has lost some of its strength.

Q. It has lost 84 per cent of its strength, hasn't it?

A. Yes, sir. I base that on the assumption that the original strength of that bolt is about from forty-six to fifty thousand pounds per square inch, the original tensile strength; the locomotive works now use a factor of safety on all their stay-bolts of 4½, and that conforms with the usuage they had when I was there, on which we used ten thousand pounds per square inch on every bolt we put in a locomotive where it was on a strain.

Q. If a factor of safety of 13.3 is used, that is, if a bolt is that many times stronger than it is necessary to be to stand the strain, that is enough, isn't it?

A. 13.3 per cent?

Q. No; 13.3 times. In other words, if a stay-bolt is made to stand 13.3 times more than the strain that is put on it, that is a factor of safety enough?

A. I should think so.

Re-Examination.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Hall has read you some tables here showing an experiment or experiments by a man named Coleman as set out in Kent's "Mechanical Engineer's Pocketbook." I will ask you if on the same page and on the bottom of the preceding page, 382, of that work, the author does not say that James E. Howard's tests, made in

[110] April, 1890, about nine years after the test that Mr. Hall has just spoken about, show that the strength of wrought iron increases with temperature from 6 degrees up to a maximum at from four to six hundred Fahrenheit, the increase being from 8000 to 10,000 pounds per square inch, and then decreases steadily until the strength of only 6000 pounds per square inch is shown at 1500 degrees Fahrenheit. Is that statement or not contained on page 383 of that work?

A. Yes, sir; it is. Do you want me to read it?

Q. That, then, states it ought to sustain a pressure at 1500 degrees Fahrenheit of 15,000 pounds, doesn't it?

A. It states so there.

Q. And 1500 degrees, according to the table on page 454 is practically a cherry red heat, isn't it, an incipient cherry red heat,

which is between?

A. Yes, sir; between the two.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the experiments which demonstrated that iron at the strength which I have just read were made before or after the experiments which demonstrated the strengths which Mr. Hall read to you?

A. Yes; the experiments referring to the increase in the strength up to five and six hundred degrees is the James E. Howard test, "Iron Age", April 10, 1890, and the other one, the table giving the percentage is the journal of the Franklin Institute of

[111] 1881.

Q. And I will ask you whether or not it does not state in the fifth column of that table from which Mr. Hall read to you, or it does not show that previous tests in the Franklin Institute which showed that iron had considerably stronger temperature than that test there showed, that is, as far as the test was carried in 1832 and 1836?

A. Yes, sir; they are greater.

Q. In other words, the tests which were made before and since that time, according to this book, have developed a greater holding power for fibrous wrought iron than the table from which Mr. Hall read, isn't that true?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Scrivenor, I will ask you whether or not it

[112] is possible for, and not a common occurrence, that when a crown-sheet is burned by low water, that an engine on a previous trip will let the water get low and in that way the sheet become heated and produced a bagging, and then the engine cool off and be heated afterwards with those baggings in the crown-sheet, and operated afterwards with those baggings in the crown-sheet? Is it not generally understood among scientific men that that is a fact, that a large number of locomotives run in that condition, in a condition with bags in between the bolts?

[113] Defendant objected.

By the Court:

As I understood this witness, he stated in answer to a question by Mr. Hall that bagging had been made at different times.

Witness:

Yes, that is what I said.

By the Court:

It might have been by previous heating?

POOR CO

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Mr. Hall, you brought that out on cross-examination, and I think he has a right to examine him on it; but the form of the question is objectionable, and I will sustain the objection as leading.

Q. From the best of your opinion, did the bagging in between the bolts on that crown-sheet occur at the time of the explosion or prior thereto?

A. You mean in the corner of the sheet or all over the sheet?

Q. All over the sheet, all of the bagging that you see there.

A. I think that there are indications that it was caused before.

Q. Now, Mr. Scrivenor, what did you mean by a bolt laying flat up against the crown-sheet?

A. The bolt head was faced that way, and when the bolt
[114] is pulled by every part of the face of that bolt head that exerted an even pressure upon the sheet.

Q. Suppose the crown-sheet is not tapped at a direction which is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the bolt, what is the effect of that when those button-head bolts are screwed in?

A. One side will press against the sheet and the other will not.

Q. Suppose you screw it real tight under those conditions, will that have the effect of cracking the head or not?

A. It is possible to.

Q. If it does, doesn't it weaken the bolt?

A. Yes, sir; it would weaken the bolt.

Q. I wish you would state what effect is sometimes produced upon the bolts of a crown-sheet by the fireman opening the box or opening the door and allowing cold drafts to go in?

A. The expansion of the fire box is due to heat, and if cold air is allowed to strike upon the crown-sheet of any kind of a boiler, it must contract it, if it changes its temperature at all; that subjects the bolt to unequal strain and sudden strain sometimes, and it weakens the bolt in some cases and in some cases it breaks them. In case cold air strikes it, it causes a sudden contraction, an unequal contraction of the sheet, which has been previously heated.

Q. Now, isn't it true that a bolt which fits in those holes
[115] yonder of the crown-sheet, when both are in good condition, should stand practically the same amount of strain without the bolt pulling through; that is, without the crown-sheet giving way or the bolt head breaking? In other words, is not the capacity of the

COPY

sheet and the bolt to withstand pressure or strain practically the same, or as near as they can get them the same?

A. Without a fracture?

Q. Yes?

A. I should say they would be; I do not know definitely exactly what proportion it is, but I would say they are about alike.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the rings around the holes of that crown-sheet there could not have been made just as well when the sheet was cold as when it was hot; I mean the little de-
[116] pressions?

A. Some of them have been faced.

Q. What do you mean by "faced"?

A. I do not know whether they were or not; I don't know whether they could have been. I do not think that the boiler pressure on the bolt would have made a depression in the head of the bolt if it had been cold.

Q. I am talking about, with the added strain of going down, when that strain is added to the ordinary normal boiler pressure, that is, the momentum, the starting to give way?

A. No; I do not think so.

Q. You do not think what?

A. I do not think it would make any difference, or there would be any added strength.

Q. I want you to take this bolt and see if you can find a single hole in that crown-sheet that looks like it would fit into it, and corresponds to the way that bolt is.

A. You mean to try every hole?

Q. Take it over there and see if you can find any holes you think that will fit in.

(Witness goes to crown-sheet and tries the same.)

A. There is one here that will very nearly fit it, but not quite

Q. You do not see any, then, that it absolutely fits in?

A. No, sir; I said here is one that it very nearly fits in, but I could not get it into the hole on account of a bit of burr or thread on the face of the bolt head, and there is also on the edge of the bolt a face or facet which looks like it had been struck by a hammer
[117] which would not fit in any on the sheet, I mean in any hole on the sheet; that is what you asked me, whether there was anything that would fit that space, and I said no.

Q. If there had been filings or some sort of metal that had been left on the interior of that boiler by the people that made it, wouldn't that have caused the bolt to be damaged, that is, pieces of

iron or something laying on the crown-sheet inside?

A. I do not understand the question.

Q. Read the question to the witness, Mr. Morris.

(Question read to witness.)

A. I remember the question, all right; if you mean particles of metal left in the finished holes here (indicating) or do you mean just loose stuff scattered around?

Q. I mean when the men worked in the boiler, if they cut out and left pieces of metal in there like a piece of metal as big as that (indicating), or one or two pieces of scrap or bolts or borings?

A. I do not know what effect it would have on the crown-sheet.

Q. Don't you think that would cause the bolts to be damaged?

A. I don't know that it would.

Q. Do you know whether that would have the same effect
[118] as scale if it got covered over with little mud or something of that kind?

A. No; I do not.

Re-Cross Examination.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You say if metal and stuff like that is left there you do not think it would have any effect on the bolts?

A. I said I did not know that it would.

Q. You said awhile ago that it might cause bagging in the crown-sheet, metal or scrap or oil?

A. I said oil or scale; I do not mean metal scale.

Q. That might cause the bagging of the crown-sheet but that wouldn't effect the bolts?

A. I said it would cause an overheating of the crown-sheet.

Q. But that wouldn't effect the bolts. In other words, my question is this: if there was some oil—

A. (Interposing.) If for any reason it is overheated, the head of the bolt or the part of the bolt inside that sheet would also be heated.

Q. So the oil then would have to be right under the bolt head and around the shank of the bolt in order for it to cause the bolt to be overheated, wouldn't it?

A. No.

Q. You went over and looked at that sheet there very carefully and tried to put those bolts in, did you expect to find that they would fit in that sheet now?

[119] A. I did not expect to, because there was a burr in that

bolt head and I did not think it would go in anyway, and it did not go in.

Q. Would you expect any other bolt head to fit the contour of that sheet now—bolt heads that were broken off in that explosion, I mean?

A. I cannot say that I certainly would expect it, because I never had to try the same thing before.

Q. You never had to try the same thing before?

A. To fit the bolt head into the hole.

Q. And you don't know whether you would expect it or not, do you?

A. I beg your pardon.

Q. You don't know whether a man who is experienced in dealing with crown-sheets that have failed and drawn up as this one is, would expect to find bolt heads to fit or not, do you?

A. If the sheet had not bagged any more after the bolt parted it would fit.

Q. If it had not bagged any more after the bolt parted it would fit, you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If it did bag more after the bolt parted, it wouldn't fit would it?

A. If it did not?

Q. Yes?

A. If the sheet and the bolt—

[120] Q. (Interposing.) No, I say if it did bag more afterwards.

A. Then it is possible for the whole sheet to bag and still one portion of it to retain the same curvature it had before it bagged.

Q. You say that is possible?

A. Yes, sir; I do.

Q. Do you mean to say that it is possible for that sheet, which was perfectly straight across—

A. (Interposing.) No, you did not ask that question. May I explain myself? You said is it possible or did I think that a bolt would fit if the sheet bagged after the bolt had parted, still continued to bag after the bolt had parted, that is, I think the question; and I said it is possible for one portion of the plate to retain the same curvature it had at the time the bolt parted, even though the whole sheet generally bagged still further, there is only one small portion of the surface of the whole sheet.

Q. You think that is possible?

A. Yes, sir; because it is the holding power of the bolt that makes the sheet bag and gives it the curvature at that point.

Q. What is the shape of that sheet when it is in its normal condition?

A. Slightly arched.

Q. How much is it bent down from its true position by the explosion?

A. A little bit more than—if you put a straight edge
[121] across those two edges and measure down to the bottom of the bagging, you will find—

Q. (Interposing.) Roughly speaking, isn't it ten or eleven inches lower than it was in its true position and forced down there by the explosion?

A. Not far from that, I should say, just looking at it.

Q. Suppose you had this bagging between the stay-bolts before the stay-bolts gave way, and then when the stay-bolts did give way the whole sheet was forced down ten or twelve inches, what effect would that have on the bagging between the stay-bolts?

A. The individual bagging between the stay-bolts?

Q. Yes; would it increase or diminish the bagging?

A. I would say if the plate was cold the bagging would stay there, it would be still burned; if the sheet was hot, it would stretch out.

Q. And the bagging would be less, wouldn't it?

A. I should think so.

Q. Wouldn't it be less if it was cold?

A. It might possibly disappear altogether.

Q. If it was hot?

A. Yes; hot enough.

Q. And if it was cold, how would you get it forced down ten or eleven inches without straightening out some of that bagging between the stay-bolt holes?

A. I think that is a question entirely of the actual struc-
[122] ture of the fibers in between those bolt holes before that movement starts, and I do not think we are able to answer that question exactly without an actual test between the bolt holes and the sheet as a whole. I would say that steel in a cold state can be stretched.

Q. I do not deny that. I asked you this: If that sheet was cold, when it was practically a plain surface like this, and there was bagging between the stay-bolts and then you forced that down ten or eleven inches in the center from its true position, what effect would

that have on the bagging between the stay-bolt holes?

A. I do not think it would straighten out the bagging between the holes.

Q. You do not think so at all?

A. It might do it a little, but I do not think it would straighten it out altogether.

Q. If you got a certain distance across the length of that sheet, and it is forced down ten or twelve inches, you have got to increase that distance, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir; but good steel has an elongation of nearly thirty per cent; it is over twenty per cent in ordinary steel.

Q. When you stretch it that way, don't that have a tendency to remove the bagging?

A. I mean, a part of it can stretch without all of it stretching.

Q. When those have stretched, that would reduce the [123] bagging between the bolt holes, wouldn't it?

A. I should think it would generally, but not altogether.

Q. Generally but not altogether, it would not entirely remove the bagging, but it would lessen it some, make it less than it was before it was forced down that way?

A. It is all assuming that it is cold, though, all the time.

Q. Certainly. I am talking about a cold plate; when you heat a plate you say the bagging might be taken entirely out of it or practically so, didn't you say that?

A. I thought the plate could be made hot enough so you could stretch it to take the bagging out, because there is not the same resistance to the tightening of the fibers.

Q. You say this bagging you thought was caused before this sheet failed, didn't you?

A. I don't remember whether I did or not.

Q. Didn't you say that you thought the bagging between the stay-bolt holes was caused before the explosion?

A. Yes, sir; I did; I was referring particularly to this bagging in the upper corner.

Q. Now, if the bagging between the stay-bolt holes was sufficient to put these bolt heads which I have shown you in the shape they are in, I want to ask you whether or not that crown-sheet would have leaked when the water was afterwards put on it, under pressure?

A. I did not say that the bagging did do that. You are [124] speaking of the bagging between the bolt holes.

Q. Read my question to the witness.

(Question read to witness.)

A. You ask if the bagging had put them in that shape?

Q. Yes?

A. What I referred to was the preliminary bagging.

Q. The bagging between the stay-bolt holes, I am talking about, you said the bagging you saw there was produced prior to the explosion in your judgment?

A. I said it might have been.

Q. Might have been?

A. Yes, sir; that is my recollection.

Q. If it might have been produced prior to the explosion, and these bolt heads are the ones that broke off from the bottom part of that crown-sheet, the bagging was sufficient to put the bolt heads in that position or shape, wasn't it?

A. I did not say so.

Q. I asked you if it was not?

A. I do not think it would be.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the indications up in this left hand corner of it where I call it a small bagging between the bolt holes, does not deface or deform the metal around the hole at all.

Q. All right, if the heads of these stay-bolts were like that, with a square shoulder on them, then how could they have gotten in this shape?

A. If they had been heated?

[125] Q. If they had been heated with the crown-sheet on top of them, wouldn't the crown-sheet have had to bag sufficiently to force them into that shape?

A. Yes, I think that the crown-sheet must have practically taken that shape.

Q. In order to make the bolt heads that shape, didn't it?

A. If they were straight like that before.

Q. If they were straight like this perfect bolt which I showed you before, then in order for them to have gotten in this shape the crown-sheet must have bagged and taken that shape around the bolt?

A. Approximately; I think I said that before.

Q. Now, if that heating was done before this explosion and they took this shape before the explosion, then I ask you whether or not there would have been a leakage around those bolt heads when water was put on it in that engine under 185 pounds of pressure?

A. If they had been in that shape?

Q. Yes?

A. If the threads had not been a good fit there most probably

would have been leakage.

Q. Would the threads have been a good fit if they were in that shape, if the crown-sheet was stretched and bagged to that extent?

A. No, I do not think they would if the crown-sheet had been stretched to the shape of those bolt heads; I do not think the threads would have been a good fit.

Q. And if water had been put on it when in that shape
[126] under 185 pounds of pressure, you think there would have been bound to have been leakage around these bolt heads?

A. If they had been in that shape

Q. That is what I said, if they had been in that shape.

A. I think so.

Q. I believe you say you live in Richmond, do you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you happen to be up here today?

A. I was requested to come here.

Q. By whom?

A. By Mr. Staples.

Q. And you came up here to testify as an expert witness in this case, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you had not seen this crown-sheet or bolt heads or anything about it before you came here?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. But you had it described to you, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[127] L. S. RANDOLPH.

L. S. Randolph, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. I wish you would state your occupation and experience in matters involving the application of the principles involved in this case as you have just heard Mr. Scrivenor testify?

A. I would say that I am a machinist by trade, having learned my trade in the shops of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. After three years spent there, I graduated as a mechanical engineer at the Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, after which I was for two and a

half years chief chemist and engineer of tests for the New York, Lake Erie & Western Railroad, now the Erie. After that I was for eighteen months superintendent of motive power, the title then was master of machinery, of the Florida Railroad & Navigation Company, with offices at Fernandina, Florida. After that for two and a half years I was in a similar position with the Cumberland & Pennsylvania Railroad at Mount Savage, Maryland; for about two and a half years as engineer of tests and chief chemist for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at Baltimore. A year with the Baltimore Electrical Company, of Baltimore, Maryland, as electrical engineer; since which time, about twenty-one years, I have been professor of mechanical engineering at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, having more or less charge of their power plant and doing considerable outside consulting work.

Q. Do you teach mechanical engineering questions, and
[128] principles involved in this case?

A. Steam boilers and railway engineering, and railway machinery, both of those subjects.

Q. Have you examined the crown-sheet in this case?

A. I have—this one?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury whether or not there is any indication that that crown-sheet went down from the absence of water over it at the time?

A. At the time when the big bag occurred?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. I can see no indication of an absence of water there.

Q. If the sheet had been very hot at the time of the failure would it have the color that it now has?

A. It depends on what you call "very hot". I have seen several bag that way, where they were unquestionably very hot, nearly white hot, and they were always red. Furthermore, the surface was rough, and there was no sign of what we call mill scale on it. If you will notice there is a brown or dark blue scale on that, what we know as mill scale.

Q. You mean that was made there at the time it was manufactured?

A. At the time it was rolled.

Q. Is that mill scale destroyed by the intense heat?

[129] A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the sheet had been at white heat, or extremely hot

would the surface have presented the same appearance it now presents?

A. No, sir; not in my opinion.

Q. In what respect would it have differed?

A. It would have been rough and reddish in color.

Q. Would it have required special treatment to make it look like it does now?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. What do you mean by special treatment?

A. Rerolling, or restretching, or probably reheating to get that red scale off and it might have brought it back to the blue for awhile then it would have oxidized very quickly.

Q. How hot do you think the sheet could have been and retained the appearance which it now presents?

A. I do not think that has ever been beyond the dark red.

Q. At what time do you think it probably was heated a dark red?

A. The bagging there, the little bagging between the bolts indicates that it has been heated to a dark red sometime in the past; it is difficult to say just when. Prior to the time the main bag was made.

Q. Prior to the time of the failure of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir. I ought to say to the jury in that connection that there is not sufficient evidence here to properly check that opinion. We have nothing but a piece of iron here; there is no—except for the one set of rivet holes in here—there is nothing to say what its position was, it may have been over on one side or the other side

[130] It was evidently apparently near the flue sheet, but outside of that I cannot say whether it was more down on one side of the fire box than the other, and therefore, just the location of those bags, it is difficult to say whether they were due to mud or oil, or sometime previously, low water.

Q. Suppose some sort of metallic substance, or pieces of iron or bolts had been left in there by the manufacturers, and had laid on top of that sheet, would that have had the effect of making it bag probably?

A. I cannot imagine how anything of that kind would have affected it.

Q. You do not think that would have affected it?

A. I cannot imagine how it would have affected it.

Q. But you think mud or oil might cause it, without the absence of water from the sheet?

A. It might cause it.

Q. Now, what is the tensile strength of fibrous wrought iron 1⅛ inch bolt, at the temperature of boiling water, with 185 pounds

of pressure, approximately?

A. Ordinarily good grade of stay-bolt iron?

[131] Q. The best you can get?

A. It runs fifty thousand cold; I never made any test at steam temperature.

Q. What should that bolt withstand at a dull red heat?

A. What is the size of the bolt?

Q. 1⅛ inches.

A. Threaded, button head bolt?

Q. Yes, sir?

A. Somewhere in the neighborhood of eight or nine or ten thousand pounds.

Q. You mean each bolt should withstand that pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. To how many pounds pressure is one of those bolts subjected with the maximum pressure of the boiler 185 pounds?

A. Those are four by fours—something under three thousand.

Q. Sixteen times 185, or 2960 pounds?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What pressure should those bolts stand at bright red heat according to reported tests that you have studied?

A. About seven or eight thousand pounds.

Q. Then at bright red heat, as I understand you, the bolts of which that boiler was made, if they had been in good, perfect condition, should have stood about eight or nine thousand pounds pressure, or two or three times the pressure of the boiler?

A. Two or three times the steam pressure on it.

Q. When the safety valve was popping off?

[132] A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, is it true or not, that the bolts in that boiler could have been heated to a more intense heat than bright red, in order for the failure to have been caused exclusively by absence of water on the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, if all the bolts had been in good condition?

A. Your question says exclusively?

Q. Then, I understand you to mean, if all the bolts had been in good condition and the failure had been caused by low water alone, it would have to have been heated to a higher temperature than bright red?

A. Yes.

Q. I show you here a bolt head, which you will see is broken

off up in the head, in a concave way—here are five or six bolts, all of which are broken off in the head. If those bolts came out of that boiler, and were broken at the time of the failure, I will ask you to state to the jury what that method of breaking indicates.

A. To explain to the jury—have you got a large full-size stay-bolt here?

Q. Here is one that is threaded. (Hands same to witness.)

A. When those are put in, they are screwed into the sheet and then a wrench is put on here and they are screwed down so tight as to twist that off. Let the jury examine those, as to the points of them (shows same to jury).

Q. I wish you would explain to the jury the method of
[133] seating those bolts, which have resulted in their being cracked by tight pressure in screwing them up to the crown-sheet?

A. You see your screwing them here, you have got the pressure of the thread there (indicating) one way, and the underside of this head here, just like any ordinary bolt, and you screw it down like this, and it tightens it and puts the strain on the bolt, and that strain comes between that point there, its maximum is there, between that point and the head. That is always very great, and the practice is a little different, as well as I can get at it, some relying on the fit of the thread there to keep the leakage, others on this pressure right around in here, to fit there. Sometimes, and this looks as if it had been intended, a copper wire or something is put around in that groove to stop the leakage. Now, under those circumstances, that puts a heavy strain way out to this edge here, then if there is any distortion, that puts it still greater, and a comparatively light degree of heat may have caused that to break in there. Now, in regard to that, one curious thing that occurs in regard to iron and steel both, and I could best describe it by an experiment which was made, and where I first saw it. A piece of steel, used for boilers, and I have seen the same thing occur with iron, this piece of steel was about that long and about that wide (indicating), and possibly three-eighths or half an inch thick, it was heated on one end and turned over and folded down flat
[134] heated to more than bright red, almost white heat, the other end was cold, turned over and folded down, cold in between, it was heated to a black heat, what we call black heat, and the slightest attempt to bend that cracked it, so that at black heat, both iron and steel are likely to crack. The steady straight-way pull on it does not always show it up, but it is brittle when cold or when quite hot, and would take an amount of movement in there that it would not when black hot, say just under a dark red. We do not know exactly what

that temperature is, I have never found it, but somewhere about that temperature. Now, that would cause that to break off, even when that thread there is usually considered strong enough, if it fits well to hold the load.

Q. You mean, if I understand you, and I don't know whether I got that very clear or not, that when this is screwed up very tight against the crown-sheet, and a bad fit is made of it, if the sheet is heated to a cherry red temperature, the expansion of the crown-sheet causes that to crack off?

A. Yes, sir; it will cause it to crack right down there, and furthermore, of course, if it bears unevenly on one side or the other the strain is entirely put on one side and that makes it crack.

Q. And some of those bolts, as I understand you to say, might be completely cracked off and drop down into the fire?

A. Yes, sir.

[135] Q. Is that illustrated in the difference between these two bolts, one of which was produced here, not having been in the fire, and this other one here, as to the different method produced that way?

A. I do not see very much difference in those, except the one that was not in the boiler has a little blue scale on it yet.

[136] (Manuscript page 136 marked out.)

[137] (Manuscript page 137 marked out.)

[138] (Manuscript page 138 marked out.)

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Are you familiar with the Sellers non-lifting injector, the type used on the engine in question in this case?

A. I saw one for a few moments in Roanoke last spring.

[139] Q. You are familiar with the principles upon which injectors generally work, are you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The injector which you saw was the one that Mr. Slayton showed you at Roanoke, and represented to be identical with the one in question here?

A. I think it was the one on that engine.

Q. I wish you would explain to the jury whether or not that is a simple thing that the engineer can work with ease, and whether or not there ought to be any mistake made?

A. Yes; it is simple, and there is a difference of opinion in regard to them. A non-lifting type must be below the level of the water in the tank so that the water runs to it. Now, the
[140] lifting type is above that level and is usually either in the cab or close to the cab. I have some objection to the non-lifting type, for it is a little difficult to hear and out of reach, and I have had some trouble with it, in operating myself I always had some difficulty and I could not operate them as well as I could the lifting type, but a great many of the best railroads in this country use them and use them straight along, and the fact that the non-lifting type seems in the last few years to have come into service, I should say it was a good injector.

Q. An engineer can tell easily enough whether it is working and putting water into the boiler, can he not?

A. I never had much trouble except sometimes on dark rainy nights, it is a little difficult to tell, but we used the non-lifting type on the Erie, and I had some difficulty there telling, but generally by either putting your hand on the feed pipes or on the lever, you could feel the vibration or generally hear it.

Q. If the injector breaks, the steam escapes?

A. Yes, sir; down underneath, where sometimes they put that valve, and that is one of the dangers, they have got it so that it runs into the ash pan so as to keep the waste water in the ash pan
[141] and in that case the steam goes into the ash pan and can be seen with difficulty. If I recollect, I think the one here, that tell-tale one is outside, so that the steam went out and the man could look out of his window and see whether his injector was working or not.

Q. Can you hear the noise of escaping steam when the injector does not work?

A. I doubt very much whether you could hear the noise as much as the hum of the injector working.

Q. Have you ever operated one of these Sellers non-lifting injectors?

A. I operated one that time, that is the only type I ever operated, this type (indicating).

Q. If the glass water guage was in good, perfect condition at the time it was turned over to the engineer at Roanoke, could it have been possible for scale to have been deposited on it in such a way as to cause it to register erroneously an hour or so later?

A. You will have to define what you mean by scale, the question as stated there seems to indicate that you mean lime salts, which

are deposited from the water. I do not see how it would be possible for those lime salts to close up that guage in an hour or so, if it had been in anywhere near its proper condition when it left Roanoke.

[142] Court takes a recess until tomorrow morning, Wednesday, October the 7th, 1914, 9:30 a. m.

[144] OCTOBER 7, 1914, 9:30 A. M.—MORNING SESSION.

Continuation of the evidence in chief on behalf of the plaintiff.

L. S. Randolph, resuming the stand.

Direct-examination continued by Mr. Staples:

Q. Professor Randolph, state whether or not the condition of the pocketing between the bolts on that crown-sheet indicates that the sheet was covered with water when it failed?

A. I think so; yes, sir.

Q. The end of the crown-sheet over there where the rivet holes are is the highest part, isn't it, in the engine?

A. That is what I understood, that was the part next to the flue sheet.

Q. The part this way is the highest part?

A. Yes, sir; the part next to the flue sheet, which would be the highest part.

Q. I want you to come over here and look at this crown-sheet (witness does so). As I understand it, when that crown-sheet is in the engine, it is on a slope; in other words, it is not level with the ground but one end of it is titled higher than the other?

A. Yes, sir. And then it is rounded over.

[145] Q. In a sort of an arch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the end up this way is the highest end of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, you have just looked at that crown-sheet and I will ask you to state whether or not it does not show that some of the bolts up in the highest part of the crown-sheet have been cut out since the explosion or since the failure of the crown-sheet?

A. They have been drilled out, the indications are that they have been drilled out and the drill has cut part of the sheet.

Q. That indicates, doesn't it, that those bolts—

Q. What does that indicate?

A. May I finish that answer?

Q. Yes.

A. I do not see any signs, if that is the central part of the sheet, I do not see any signs of cutting right at the highest point, but that cutting has been down here and down here (indicating), but as the sheet stands there I cannot say whether it is the center sheet or just one side or the other. Now, that bulge may have been over here or over here (indicating), and if it has been cut out that way or this way (indicating), then these stays that were drilled out would be nearer the highest part of the sheet.

Q. All the bolts up in the forward end of the crown-sheet
[146] would be higher than any bolt in that same row further back on the crown-sheet?

A. Any bolt in that same row; yes, sir.

Q. I don't know whether you noticed when you were over there, if you did not I want you to look and see, if some of the bolts are not cut out in the forward end of the high part of the crown-sheet, whereas the bolts further back which would not have been subjected to heat in low water, have not been cut out?

A. That bolt (indicating) has apparently been drilled out, this one has been cut with a chisel and broken off, nicked as we call it, with a chisel. Now, here is one that has been drilled out and I see no signs of that one or that one or any of those back that way having been drilled out. There is one that is rubbed a little as if it might have been drilled out, but I cannot tell what did that.

Q. How about these down here on this row, this one?

A. That has been drilled out.

Q. Have any of these others in that same row been drilled?

A. No, sir; I do not see any signs of their being drilled.

Q. Now, I will ask you to look at the bottom part down there, the part next to the ground, and see if you do not find a similar condition as the bolts up in the crown-sheet, having been
[147] drilled out when the bolts in the same row further down the sheet were pulled out or broke off?

A. These two bolts there and the second and third of this first row appear to me like as if the heads had been cut with a chisel from the outside and the bolts taken out. Of course, one cannot say whether the chisel marks are made actually by some one or whether it was done chipping the bolts out.

Q. What does that indicate as to the bolts that were in those holes?

A. It indicates that the bolts must have been in there and taken out after the failure.

Q. Does it indicate or not, that the bolts which were first or longest subjected to heat held out longest, that is, if there had been low water?

A. No, sir; I couldn't say that, because those two are off on the side and therefore the sheet being curved in front like that, first subjected to the heat, is the top part.

Q. I am talking with respect to other bolts in that same row.

A. Oh, it does with bolts in that same row; yes, sir.

Q. It does indicate that the bolts which have been subjected first and longest to heat than any other bolt in that same row, have held out, whereas the other bolts which were not heated as quickly or as long, gave way, assuming that it should have occurred from low water?

A. Read the question.

(Question read to witness.)

A. I think that is true, but you should take into account that first row, those bolts are supported by a sheet, but then there are two or three bolts back of that that have been drilled out. That [148] one was drilled out and this one was drilled out (indicating), I could not tell whether the failure there was enough, but it does not look here as if the failure was enough to break that bolt.

Q. Does that condition indicate or not, that the accident or failure was caused by low water?

A. What condition?

Q. In reference to the holding out of those bolts in the high part of the crown-sheet?

A. It does not to me; no, sir.

Q. It does not indicate to you what?

A. That the failure was caused by low water. The second bolt there, if that had been hot, and if those behind it had been hot, should have pulled before they did (indicating).

Q. Does it indicate the contrary to your mind?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, if the button-head bolts had been properly screwed into the crown-sheet and properly fitted, and had pulled out when hot, would it or not in your opinion have left them in the sharp condition like they now are; that is, if the sheet had been hot when they pulled through or broke?

A. My opinion is that if the button-head bolts, as were testified were in that sheet, had failed because of being hot, sufficiently hot to cause a failure, they would not have pulled through the

[149] sheet, but the bolts would have broken off inside the sheet, on the water side, just inside where the greater strain is.

Q. What about the condition of the threads?

A. It would not have pulled out the threads at all. I should add to that, it would either have done that or pulled the head clear through, it depends on whether the bolts were weaker than the sheet or the sheet weaker than the bolts.

Q. The bolts which are fastened into this crown-sheet go up into what?

A. They go into the wagon top sheet as it is sometimes called.

Q. Suppose there is a change of relationship or a shifting between those sheets, what effect does that have on the bolt heads?

[150] (Manuscript page 150 marked out.)

[152] A. Read the question over again, please.

(Question read to witness.)

A. I cannot answer it, because my entire opinion is based on that very careful study of the whole subject and those experiments checking observation.

A. My answer to that question would be entirely based, almost entirely ,on that series of experiments and observation. It was a matter that was put up to me by the railroad company and

[152] I was working on it two or three years. I have got no other information but that, that amounts to anything; 90 per cent of my opinion is based on these observations and experiments.

Q. I want you to eliminate from your answer the detailing of any experiments which you have made, just give conclusions which you have applicable to this crown-sheet, and if you think you are qualified to state to the jury the effect of the change of the angle between those sheets upon this crown-sheet in question, the effect upon those bolt heads of the change in the angle between the

[153] sheets in this boiler, then you can answer it, otherwise you can not.

Defendant objected. Overruled. Exception.

By the Court:

If you can answer that question from your own learning on the subject, you can answer it.

By Mr. Staples:

As well as from his experiments?

By the Court:

I said from his learning on the particular subject, you can answer it.

A. Including everything?

By the Court:

What does learning mean, from your learning on the subject?

Defendant excepts.

A. I think it would have a slight effect on those bolt heads.

Q. State whether or not the change of the relative positions of those two sheets would probably weaken the bolts or bolt heads along the top of the whole crown-sheet?

A. It would tend to weaken it; I do not think the motion at the head in the crown-sheet on account of the length of the stays would be sufficient to injure the bolts very seriously unless the engine was running a long time.

By Mr. Hall:

Here are the stay-bolts that you asked for.

By Mr. Staples:

Are these all of the stays that you gentlemen have that came out of this boiler?

By Mr. Slayton:

These are all that are here, that we have; no, I think there are more in the box over there, and I will get them all.

(Stay-bolts are here produced.)

[154 Q. Is this bolt in such a condition now that you can tell anything about it at this time?

By the Court:

Speak out, Mr. Staples; I cannot hear anything you say.

A. No, sir; I cannot tell anything about it.

By the Court:

Is that one of the bolts that is admitted came out of the crown-sheet after the failure of the engine?

By Mr. Staples:

Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell anything about this one (indicating)? Here

is a bolt that has been treated in some way, I do not know what has been done to it, it doesn't furnish us much light.

A. In answer to the other question, apparently this is one of those that were drilled out of the sheet; it looks as if it was, but it is so rusted I cannot tell much about it.

Q. These two bolts here are the only ones which the defendant has produced, as I am informed by them, which have not been experimented with or treated in some way since the failure of the crown-sheet. Are these two in such a condition that you can tell anything about them?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why can't you tell anything about these from their present condition?

A. Because what I would base it on would be the char-
[155] acter of the fracture at the end of the bolt, most of that in both of those cases apparently has been cut away and what is left is rusted so I cannot tell anything about it.

Q. Both look like they have been exposed to the weather since that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you had the bolts that came out of that boiler and they had been kept from exposure to weather conditions, could you take those bolts and examine them and tell whether they had been broken while hot or cold?

By the Court:

That question simply amounts to asking whether you can take a piece of iron and tell whether it was broken cold or hot. Answer the question.

A. I think I could; yes.

Q. Now, as to the button-head bolts, is there a liability to injury when they are screwed into the fire box where the holes are not tapped at right angles to the sheet and where the surface of the sheet is curved?

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the question, to the substance of the question and not to the form.

A. If your Honor please, I want to change that question a little bit. The tapping—there are two holes to be considered in order to make it clear to the jury, the tapping of one hole at right angles to the sheet, whether that hole is tapped at right angles to the

[156] sheet does not matter so very much, but tapping or having both holes punched so that when the stay is put in the heads will come out and bear evenly all around the sheet. Now, if it is not put in so, one side of the head may bear hard and the other side not at all, and then when you screw it up tightly it will tend to crack the head off.

Q. Is it, or not, in your opinion, necessary practice in building locomotives to use a seating tool which faces off the inside of the sheet exactly at right angles to the longitudinal axis of the bolts.

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the substance of the question.

A. I think it is advisable, though if care is taken in seating those holes I do not think it necessary; or if a washer is used under the head, it would not be necessary.

Q. Is it or not true that the average holding power of the usual form of stay-bolts at a dull red or almost a black heat could be decreased from its strength cold about 50 per cent?

A. Black or dull red?

Q. A dull red or almost black?

A. I should put that figure from my own observation,

[157] 60 per cent.

Q. Is it not true that at a bright red heat the holding power would be decreased to about one-fifth of its original strength?

A. Yes, sir; about that, one-fourth or one-fifth.

Q. Is it or not true that the sudden letting down of a few bolts throws such additional load on the adjacent ones that they are frequently unable to stand the strain and tear out row by row until the whole crown-sheet is blown down?

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the substance of the question but not to the form.

A. Changing that one word "frequently" and making it "may", would say yes.

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the answer in its amended form.

Q. What is the usual effect upon a crown-sheet where the bolts are in good condition and are subjected to sufficient strain to break them hot or cold, that is, as to the tendency to pull through?

A. The usual effect on the crown-sheet is to bag it down between some of the bolts and then when they give why the rest of it goes.

Q. As to the tendency to pull through the crown-sheet?

[158] A. Well, it depends on whether the crown-sheet is stronger than the bolt. Of course, if the bolts are larger than the thickness of the sheet, they will pull through; if smaller they will break off.

Q. I mean the effect on the crown-sheet itself where you have, say, three-eighths of an inch of crown-sheet and one and one-eighth of an inch of a button-head bolt?

A. They would pull away, a little way through, and might break and might pull all the way through.

Q. Is there or not a characteristic appearance left on the crown-sheet as the result of that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find it present on this crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not frequently that engines can be seen in service with the crown-sheet bagged down in between the bolts?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As is shown by that crown-sheet?

A. Smaller bags.

Q. If a crown-sheet should be heated while in service by low water and the water afterwards came over and covered the crown-sheet, would it or not, or might it or not, weaken the holding power of the bolts?

A. Read that question to me again.

[159] (Question read to witness.)

A. I do not think the water coming over it would weaken it so much as the heating.

Q. You say the heating would weaken the holding power of the bolt?

A. In other words, I think any weakening of the holding power of the bolt would be prior to the water having come on it.

Q. What are those little baggings in between the bolts and what do they indicate?

A. It indicates to me that it has been slightly warm.

Q. Previous to this time?

A. Previous to this time of total failure.

Q. What do you mean by slightly warm?

A. Probably a dark red, hardly hotter than that. I do not think the sheet looks as if it had been heated more than a dark red. It does not look like it has been heated more than that since it left the mill.

Q. Does it present the appearance of its quality or character having been changed very materially since it left the mill?

A. No, sir.

Q. Is it not true that a crown-sheet may be subjected to heat, that is to say, a dull red heat probably, and the water put back on it, and the meantime these pockets having been formed, and yet the crown-sheet not developed any leakage?

A. My opinion is that very frequently happens.

[160] Q. Is it or not true that the holding power of the threads of those bolts is sufficient to sustain the crown-sheet at ordinary pressure, in proper condition, not taking into consideration the holding power of the head of the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You testified in this case before, didn't you, in the Federal Court at Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had you opportunity at that time to give the case a very careful study or were you called up very suddenly?

A. Only two or three days.

Q. Have you studied it considerably since then?

A. I have gone through this matter afterwards. I dropped it entirely and did not think of it for a month or so and taken it up again so as to check my previous opinion to see if I was in error in any way.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. I believe you say that this crown-sheet which has been offered in evidence by the defendant shows that it has been burned, that is, overheated without water on top of it at some time in its history?

A. The small bags indicate that it has been, possibly about a dark red heat, possibly a bright red; but I think a dark red.

[161] Q. Professor Randolph, I am going to ask you very simple questions now and if you will just answer my questions we will get along faster. My question was simply this, as to whether or not the appearance of that crown-sheet now indicates that at some time in its history it has been overheated with water not on top of it?

A. I answered the question.

By Mr. Staples:

I think he answered your question.

Q. Do you say it was or was not?

A. Do I have to answer yes or no to that, your Honor?

By the Court:

No, you can answer your own way or to the best of your knowledge, information and belief.

A. I will answer it this way: it has been hotter than it was ever intended to be by the makers; will that suit you?

Q. Is it what is ordinarily called by engineers and boiler makers a burned crown-sheet?

A. No, I do not think so.

Q. What do they mean by saying that a crown-sheet has been overheated or burned?

A. A burned crown-sheet means that it has been so hot as to cause its failure.

Q. How do you describe a crown-sheet that has had water off a portion of it and been heated sufficient to show the effect of it, as you say is shown on this sheet, that does not fail?

A. Scorched.

Q. You—then you say that the bags between the stay-bolt holes of this sheet show it has been scorched?

A. At some previous time; yes, sir.

[162] Q. At some previous time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would state to the jury what area of that sheet shows that it has been scorched?

A. There is some part that has gone down, all of that, with some parts outside. There are indications of that through little distances outside from the bags there, that look as if they had been scorched.

Q. What I want is simply this: will you tell the jury how many feet long and how many feet wide the scorched area of that sheet is. If you don't know you can go over and look at it, measure is and come back and give us a simple answer of the length of the scorched area and the width of it.

(Witness examines plate.)

A. It looks to be about three and a quarter to three and a half feet wide and about four and a half feet long.

Q. Do you remember whether you measured the area of the scorched sheet when you testified in the case in Roanoke?

A. No, sir; I do not remember.

Q. You do not remember whether you did or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. So you give the area now as three and a quarter to three and a half feet wide?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And four and a half feet long?

A. About four and a half feet long.

[163] Q. If that much of that crown-sheet was scorched as you call it, was it scorched with a fire under it and with no water on top of it?

A. May I amend that question?

Q. No; I prefer asking my own questions and I would like for you to answer it.

A. I cannot answer it.

Q. Say that you cannot answer it then.

A. I cannot answer it. Read me the question again, Mr. Morris.

(Question read to witness.)

A. There is only one way I can answer that; it may or it may not, which is the same thing.

Q. I will ask you this question: did that scorched area have water on top of it when it was scorched?

A. It may or it may not.

Q. Under what conditions may it have had water on top of it?

A. The scorching may have been due to mud or oil.

Q. Would it have had to have oil or mud on top of the whole area in order to scorch it that way?

A. At some time or another, part may have been scorched—it looks as if—my idea is from the looks of it that it was scorched without any water on top of it.

Q. You think it was scorched without any water on top of it?

A. Yes, sir; it may have been scorched either way; the appearances indicate that it is more likely to have been scorched without any water on top of it.

Q. Your opinion then is that that area was scorched with-

[164] out any water on top of it?

A. There is hardly information there enough to form a definite opinion just how it was scorched, whether from mud, oil, or low water; but it was scorched.

Q. Why do you say that it was scorched, what are your reasons for saying that area was scorched?

A. The little bags in between the bolts.

Q. How were those bags produced?

A. By the metal getting hot, and the only way in which it could get hot readily would be by water not being in contact with the sheet.

Q. It would have to have pressure on it to cause the bags, wouldn't it?

A. Yes—wait a minute—not necessarily, no. Not necessarily.

Q. You mean that you could heat it so hot that the iron would be in such a molten condition that it would bag down of its own weight without any pressure on it?

A. No, I do not mean that.

Q. What do you mean?

A. I mean that it gets red hot and the expansion of that sheet would make the sheet longer than it previously had been and that would be taken up by buckles between the bolts. Now, in order to make the question clear all around, the fact that nearly all these are down indicates that there was pressure on those, and if those
[165] buckles had occurred with no pressure on them, why some of them would probably have been up and others down.

Q. So then, if I understand you, you think that this bagging between the stay-bolt holes was caused by the sheet being hot under pressure?

A. Yes, under pressure.

Q. And without water on top of it?

A. It looked that way to me; yes, sir.

Q. To what extent are those spaces between the stay-bolt holes bagged?

A. Very slightly.

Q. You told us within a fraction of an inch the last time how they were bagged, can you do it this time?

A. From one-eighth to three-sixteenths of an inch, about, I should say.

Q. And you say that that bagging occurred before the crown-sheet blew down and failed, that is your opinion, is it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that bagging that existed at the time the crown-sheet blew down greater or less than it is now?

A. You mean the bagging between the bolts?

Q. Yes, sir; the bagging between the bolts.

A. Some places greater, apparently greater that is greater before; at other places it looks as if it was less than it is now.

Q. At what places was it greater?

A. Right in the center of the big bag there, it looks as if
[166] the previous bagging had stretched out a little bit.

Q. Isn't that true of the bagging of the entire area that is covered by the big bag that appears there?

A. I think some of them. It looks as if the bolts had failed and the pull that way (indicating) had caused the bag to become a little greater. In other words, the sheet holding there when it pulled down and pulled crooked on that bolt, it would push this part of the sheet up and this part down (indicating) and cause that bag to be a little greater than it had been before.

Q. My question was whether or not the bagging between the stay-bolts over the entire area that had been pushed down out of its normal position, wasn't stretched out and made less in being forced down in the position that it now is?

A. I think I have answered that question.

Q. Can you answer it again, please, sir?

A. In the central part there, the big part of the bag, the lowest part, it looks as if it had been stretched out and the bags made a little smaller. In the other part, as it were, the bolts evidently pulled at an angle before they broke, the bags appear to be a little larger than they would have been normally.

Q. Why do you say larger than they would have been normally?

A. Or larger than they were previously.

Q. Than they were previously?

[167] A. Yes, sir.

Q. How large were they previously?

A. Judging roughly there, from one-eighth to three-sixteenths.

Q. You said a few minutes ago that from one-eighth to three-sixteenths, now I want to ask you how much larger were they previously?

A. Did I say that?

Q. Let the stenographer turn back and see.

(Stenographer here reads witness' previous evidence on this subject.)

Q. I mean previous to the failure and before they were stretched out?

A. I said before that—previous to the failure they were about one-eighth or three-sixteenths.

Q. You said that before?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you intend to say when I was asking you about the extent the sheet was bagged—

A. (Interposing.) Before the failure.

Q. That the bagging was before the failure one-eighth to three-sixteenths?

A. The bagging before the failure was about one-eighth or three-sixteenths.

Q. When you answered the question before and gave the extent of the bagging, did you give the extent of the bagging that now exists between the stay-bolt holes or the bagging that existed before the explosion occurred?

A. The bagging that existed before the failure.

[168] Q. That is what you gave before?

A. That is what I intended to give.

By Mr. Staples:

What do you mean by before, Mr. Hall?

By Mr. Hall:

I mean at the last trial. Professor Randolph understands what I am talking about.

By Mr. Staples:

I don't know whether he does or not.

A. Yes; I understand.

Q. I now want to hand you some bolt heads and ask you this question: if those bolt heads came off of the part of the crown-sheet that failed and were broken off by the faillure, was the shape of the crown-sheet around those bolts in the same shape that the heads of the bolts are next to the crown-sheet?

A. Did you use the present or past tense, was or is?

Q. I asked you was.

A. At the time of the failure?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes; I should say so.

Q. The crown-sheet around the bolt holes follows the contour of the upper surface of those bolt heads?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the bagging of that crown-sheet was sufficient between those stay-bolt holes to have put the stay-bolt holes in that shape, wasn't it?

A Prior to the failure?

[169] Q. Yes.

A. No; I do not think so.

Q. Why not?

A. Take this one for instance. That has been put in that shape by the sheet pulling down here on this side (indicating); that sheet has gone down this way, because if you look across there you will see, gentlemen of the jury, that those two surfaces are nearly on the same level and come out nearly straight If you look across that way you see that surface runs down that way (indicating).

Q. When the sheet had forced it down that way, pulling one side harder than the other, was the bolt head hot or cold?

A. I should not say this was hot, it is apparently hot enough to change the color condition of that broken surface, but I cannot say.

Q. Didn't you say to the jury that one side of that bolt head was forced down so much further than the other that it indicated that it was pulled down there at the time the failure occurred?

A. Yes; at the time of the failure.

Q. In other words, if I understand you, this side of this bolt head was forced down so much lower than the other side?

A. No; this side (indicating), those edges there.

Q. More than the side of it in another position and—

A. (Interposing.) In other words—

Q. (Interposing.) Wait until I finish the question. I
[170] understood you and I want to get it down. It is forced down so much lower on one side than it is at another place on the bolt head that you think that it was forced down lower on this side by being pulled down that way in the explosion (indicating).

A. At the time of the failure; yes, sir.

Q. Now, my question is, and I will repeat it, whether or not this bolt head when it was forced in that shape that you have described, lower on one side than on the other side, was it hot or cold? In other words, did it have water on top of the crown-sheet or did it not?

A. The looks of the bolt would indicate that it was not hot. If you will define heat there as red heat or something above?

Q. I don't care about defining heat at all.

A. I must define it to use my terms.

Q. All I want is for you to say to this jury, Professor Randolph, whether the top part of the crown-sheet had water on it at the time that head was forced in that shape, in the shape you have described it was forced in, at the time of the failure, or whether it did not have water on it; that is all I want you to say.

A. Read the question, please.

(Question read to witness.)

A. It may have had water on it a short while before and the

water gone off.

Q. How long before?

A. Just a fraction of a second, possibly.

[171] Q. So then, by removing the water from the top of the crown-sheet for a fraction of a second the head of that bolt would become so heated—

A. (Interposing.) No—

Q. (Interposing.) Wait a minute and let me ask the question and then you can answer it. Would become so heated beyond the temperature that it has when the crown-sheet had water on it, that it would be forced in that shape by the crown-sheet?

A. No. Read the question over again and see if I can get it straight.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. The point is this, Mr. Hall, that may have been off on one side, we do not know what part of the sheet that came from, and the water gone down and it may have put out the fire, so there wouldn't be anything to heat it, so there would not be anything to heat it, so it was not hot, in the definition I gave of heat a little while ago, that it was not white hot.

Q. All right. I will ask you this question: Will you tell the jury whether or not a bolt head of that kind under a crown-sheet can be sufficiently heated with water on top of the crown-sheet to cause it to change the shape and to be put in the shape that bolt is by the crown-sheet being pressed against it by an explosion?

A. It might have been put in that shape cold.

Q. By the crown-sheet?

A. The motion of the crown-sheet; yes, sir.

[172] Q. You say it could be put in that shape cold?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What pressure would it take to put the head of the bolt in that shape when it is cold?

A. The pressure in the boiler or the pressure on the bolt?

Q. The pressure in the boiler, what pressure in the boiler would create enough strain on the bolt?

A. It depends on how much previous area around that bolt had been weakened when the bolt failed.

Q. As I understand you, that cold crown-sheet or one that has water on top of it, can be forced in such a shape as to put the bolt head in that shape cold?

A. Yes.

Q. What sort of pressure in the boiler would it take to force

the crown-sheet, which is three-eighths of an inch thick, into that shape?

A. To force the crown-sheet in that shape, you mean to have the crown-sheet force the bolt in that shape?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. That is what you mean?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, 185 pounds would do it, if enough of the other stays around there were broken, to put pressure on.

Q. With water on top of it?

A. Yes, sir; water on top of it.

Q. How many other stays around would it be necessary to be broken?

A. I would have to give—I suppose for your purpose at [173] least ten or fifteen.

Q. This is the bolt that you have just examined, and that you say is forced down more on one side than the other; it is marked No. 12, as indicated by these dots on it, isn't it?

A. 12 dots; yes, sir.

Q. Now, I show you one that has six dots on it, and I will ask you whether or not that indicates that it is forced down more on one side than it is on the other?

By Mr. Staples:

I want to interrupt you one second. Have any of these bolts been experimented with?

By Mr. Hall:

No, sir; they are just as they were picked up in the fire box.

By Mr. Staples:

I noticed that some of them had a reddish appearance and some a blueish appearance, and I thought perhaps that some of them had been experimented with.

By Mr. Hall:

No, sir.

A. Please read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that bolt head put in that shape prior to the failure or at the time of the failure?

A. I think it must have been at the time of the failure.

Q. You mean that it was forced down on one side at the time of the failure?

A. Unless there was a partial failure prior to this one.

[174] Q. If there had been a partial failure prior to this one, what would have occurred?

A. The engine might have run on.

Q. What do you mean by a partial failure then?

A. If one, two, or three bolts had gone.

Q. The heads dropped off?

A. Yes, sir; or the bolts broken.

Q. Which do you mean, the heads dropped off or the bolts broken?

A. Either one.

Q. I will ask you to look at this one, it seems to be No. 10, and I will ask you to state whether or not that bolt head took that position when it was heated or when it was cold, or as cold as it would be with the crown-sheet with water on top of it?

A. In order that the jury can understand that, I would like to hand this to them.

Q. Very well, do so.

A. You notice that is very dark down in there and light blue here (indicating), that looks like fresh iron in here. Now, unquestionably, that fresh iron looks like the last of that fracture was when it was cold, it looks as if it had dropped down possibly for a moment or had gotten in some place to make that light blueish streak in the center, the other part looks as if it had been hot some time

[175] and turned a dark blue. You will also have to take into account that it has been standing for some time and there is a little rust there that obscures the fracture.

Q. So you say this fracture took place when it was cold?

A. This last part; yes, sir.

Q. You mean this part up here (indicating)?

A. This projecting part that is bent over.

Q. And when did the other part of it take place; was it hot or cold?

A. It looked as if it was hot.

Q. Now, here are two that have no projections at all; I wish you would look at them and state whether the failure took place there when they were hot or cold?

A. I should say that part of that failure took place when hot and part cold.

Q. Now, you mean by hot in that connection that there was fire under the sheet and no water on top of it, don't you?

A. No; I do not.

Q. What do you mean by it?

A. I mean that that bolt was about—it looks there as if there had been a dull red heat.

Q. Does a bolt get to a dull red heat under a crown-sheet when there is water on top of it?

A. It may.

Q. And the water still be on top of it?

A. On top of the crown-sheet; yes, sir.

[176] Q. How would it get in that condition, Professor?

A. By vivid combustion.

Q. What do you mean by that, what kind of a combustion do you mean?

A. A good hot fire.

Q. Do you mean to say that with the ordinary fire—

A. (Interposing.) Ordinary fire.

Q. (Continuing.) That is made in a locomotive fire box?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That you can heat the head of those bolts to a dark red heat when there is plenty of water on top of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir; and I will say that this part here has frequently been, that much of it (indicating), a dark red heat.

Q. How hot does the crown-sheet get, does it get a dark red heat too, with water on top of it?

A. I don't think it ever does, of course, free from mud and oil, you understand.

Q. Now, do I understand you to tell the jury that if these bolt heads originally had a square shoulder on top of them and were in that shape when they were placed in the crown-sheet that they could have been forced in the shape that they are in now with water covering the top of the crown-sheet?

A. What do you mean by a square shoulder; I don't see

[177] anything about a square shoulder here. I didn't say anything about a square shoulder. Read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

Q. But I did; I said that. What I mean by a square shoulder is, when the shoulder of this bolt runs in there at right angles to the bolt?

A. And fixed securely?

Q. Yes; that is what I mean.

A. Now, your question is, could that have been put in this shape with water on top of the crown-sheet?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How?

A. By other bolts near it failing and the sheet pulling down cold.

Q. So if all the other bolts around one bolt had failed and it went down cold, then the one bolt that held would have been forced in that shape?

A. No.

Q. Then that held longest—

A. Pardon me, you have got your question wrong. You say if all the other bolts around that one bolt. If a lot of bolts on one side of that bolt had failed it would probably have been put in that shape because the condition there means that this side has probably held and the sheet had gone down this way (indicating).

[178] Q. I believe you said awhile ago that this general convex shape in these bolts that are regular was made by the crown-sheet bagging down and forcing them in that shape, didn't you?

A. We had that up before and the question came up whether that bagging was done previously or at the time of the failure, and then you threw out that question; you are bringing that question back again.

Q. No; I didn't make any distinction about that. I don't care whether it was previous to the failure or not. What I asked you awhile ago was, and I think you added in your answer, that it was put in that shape previously to the failure; but what I asked you was whether or not when this bolt head on the top side of it was given a convex appearance that it now presents, if the crown-sheet around the bolt followed the contour of the bolt, and you said it did, didn't you?

A. Yes; I see your question now—at the time of failure, that is, just before they separated.

Q. I am not asking you about the time of the failure. I ask you this question and all I want you to do is to answer it, whether or not when the top side of that bolt was given that shape, if the crown-sheet around the bolt followed the contour of the bolt head?

A. Affected this (indicating)?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. At the time this was given that shape?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say further than that, that if it had a square
[170] shoulder it was given that shape by the crown-sheet's bagging and forcing it down in that shape, didn't you?

A. By the crown-sheet forcing it in that shape?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes; by the crown-sheet forcing it in that shape.

Q. Now, did that bagging of the crown-sheet between the stay-bolt holes, to put the bolt heads in that shape, occur when the crown-sheet had water on top of it or not?

A. We went over that before, that is a question—it may or may not; but if the water was not on top of it, the water must have been out enough to put out the fire so as not to let it get hot, and that change in form there, I think was done when it was cool or not hot.

Q. I wish you would look at that one and see if that has not got the same concave appearance that the other had?

A. No, sir.

Q. Has it got any concave appearance at all?

A. Slightly.

Q. Was the crown-sheet bagged around that bolt when it was forced in that shape?

A. This one looks as if it might have been caused by—the crown-sheet might have been bagged around this and caused this.

Q. Bagged around and caused it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Professor Randolph, I show you a number of crown-sheet bolt heads, marked with dots from one to twelve, and they are the ones that were picked up in the fire box of this engine after the explosion occurred in which Mr. Andrews was killed. Now,
[180] I wish you would look at the heads of them and say whether or not they indicate that there was any bagging of the crown-sheet around the heads of them or not?

By Mr. Staples:

I think the question is objectionable because counsel practically testifies as to the fact that they are the bolts which were picked up out of the fire box. As a matter of fact, the testimony of the witnesses for the defendant whose deposition was taken, stated that he saw no bolt head in that shape at all. We do not admit that they came out of this particular engine, still I have no doubt they will have witnesses

to prove that, yet I do not think counsel ought to state something as a fact that is not admitted. We do not know whether they were or not.

[181] Plaintiff excepts.

A. Now, what is the question?

(Question is read to the witness.)

A. There are one or two that indicate that it might have been caused by bagging but the others indicate that the form was caused almost entirely at the time of failure.

At this point court takes a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

[182] OCTOBER 7, 1914, 2 p. m.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

L. S. Randolph still on the stand.

Continuation of cross-examination by Mr. Hall:

Q. Professor Randolph, just before we went to dinner I showed you these bolts and I asked you whether the shape that was given to the top part of the bolt, that is the part that fits up against the crown-sheet, was given to them when they were hot or when they were cold, that is, when the crown-sheet had water on top of it or when it did not have water on top of it, and what was your answer?

A. May the stenographer read my answer also?

(The answer of the witness is here read.)

A. That was the answer to the question.

Q. That was the answer to the previous question. Now, what do you say about those bolts having taken that shape when the crown-sheet had water on top of it?

A. The substance I think was asked. The answer is, some of those bolts seem to have been put in that shape at the time of the failure. Now, my opinion is that when the failure started there was water on that crown-sheet; in other words, that the sheet was

[183] not hot; some of them out near the end; there might have been water and it might have been blown through previous to the failure of the bolts and put out the fire, and when they came to a distortion of those there was no water on the crown-sheet.

Q. You mean after they had broken off and fallen down?

A. No, I do not. I mean when they broke off, they were put in that shape when they were broken off.

Q. Would the water get off the crown-sheet before these bolts let loose?

A. It might.

Q. How?

A. By the previous bolts failing and those being the last ones to fail, they look like that.

Q. Did that crown-sheet come down gradually or did it come down all at once?

A. I should say—it looks like a portion of it failed first and the rest ripped out, the bolts indicate that.

Q. How long was it between the time the first part failed and the time the whole thing went down?

A. It might have been three or four days; it may have been as many seconds; I cannot tell.

Q. Suppose a portion of it failed before, would it have been detected when the engine was put in operation?

A. Detected when the engine was put in operation?

Q. Yes.

[184] A. It might or might not; it might have stayed down and not have been noticed at all.

Q. When that bagging took place that you referred to when the sheet was scorched before the failure, did that have any effect on changing the form of the upper part of the head of the bolt?

A. What do you mean by the upper part, the round part that fits against the sheet?

Q. Yes.

A. There are one or two that indicate they might have been put in that shape by bagging at that time.

Q. Which one or two are those? Pick them out and show them to us.

A. Those two (indicating). The jury will notice they seem to be pulled down there uniformly all around.

By the Court:

See if they are not numbered with little dots on them and give the numbers.

Witness:

This is No. 8 and No. 6.

Q. So those two indicate—

A. (Interposing.) That they might have been caused at the time of previous bagging.

Q. Might have been caused by previous bagging?

A. Not necessarily, but might have been.

Q. Would that previous bagging which you say amounted to

three-sixteenths of an inch, from one-eighth to three-sixteenths of an inch, have changed the shape of the head of those bolts?

A. It might have changed those.

[185] Q. Would it have changed the heads in the bolts that were between the points that are bagged?

A. It probably would; yes. All might have been a little pulled down a little, but probably it would have been uniform all around.

Q. Would the effect of that bagging of the crown-sheet which you say occurred prior to the accident—what effect would that have upon the threads of the stay-bolts and the threads of the crown-sheet?

A. It would tend to elongate the head, that is, elongate the holes, making the holes larger, stretch the holes, and the threads would not fit as well.

Q. Not fit as well?

A. No, sir; not fit as well.

Q. I wish you would state whether or not the threads in that crown-sheet appear to have been ripped out when the crown-sheet went down?

A. Some of them do and some of them do not.

Q. How about the lowest part of the crown-sheet, the part that went down most?

A. There is one over there that looks like I think it has been stripped.

Q. Only one?

A. I notice only one.

Q. Isn't it a fact that nearly all the threads in that bulged area of the crown-sheet are not stripped?

[186] A. Without making a critical examination, I should say that nearly 80 per cent or 90 per cent of them show very little if any signs of stripping.

Q. If this crown-sheet failed from these bolt heads breaking off as those appear to have been broken off, why did not the stay-bolt threads hold the crown-sheet in place?

A. That is on the assumption it failed from the failure of those bolts. Well, some of those are broken into the thread. Read that question over again, please.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. It would indicate that there had been a failure of others, of stay-bolts elsewhere, and these were pulled out.

Q. Pulled out how?

A. By too great a strain. For instance, there is one that I feel sure was pulled and broken at the time of the failure, and pulled

right out. You see how this sheet is bent over to one side there (indicating on exhibit No. 10).

Q. Why didn't it strip the threads then?

A. In the stripping of a thread, the thread of the bolts generally stretch or the outside of the thread, what we call the female thread, will not stretch. I have seen plenty of bolts with the threads entirely gone on the bolts, and the nut good, little or no sign of stripping on the nut or female thread.

Q. The threads are not stripped on those two that have a portion of the bolts on them, are they?

A. I did not notice them.

[187] Q. Well, are they?

A. There are signs of stripping on this one (indicating No. 9 dots) and some on this one.

Q. They are so slight that you have to examine them with a magnifying glass to see those signs of stripping, are they not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I repeat my question and ask you why, if the threads are stripped off the bolts first and generally stripped off, why they were not stripped off these two in order for these heads to break off and come out?

A. Because the head supported the nut and took the stress off the thread there. You see that was pulled out this way (indicating), and this part was bearing on the sheet, so that the strain did not come entirely on the thread that was pulled out this way.

Q. When the bolt heads were buckled, I mean made to change their shape by the buckling of the crown-sheet, what effect did that have on the diameter of the holes into which they were screwed in the crown-sheet?

A. You mean the bending of the crown-sheet, not the buckling?

Q. Yes, I mean those pockets that were formed that you have been talking about between the stay-bolts.

A. Read that question again, please.

(Question is here read to witness.)

A. It would be bound to enlarge them.

Q. Would that cause a leakage?

[188] A. Yes.

Q. Have you had any experience in inspecting crown-sheets?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you have discovered by an inspection that buckling or bagging of the crown-sheet between the stay-bolt holes which oc-

curred previous to the burning?

A. I have discovered it on other boilers and I think I could on this.

Q. There wouldn't be any trouble about discovering that, would there?

A. No, sir.

Q. Any man that knew anything about inspecting the crown-sheet of a boiler, if he had looked in there and found this buckling between the bolt holes, he could have found it without any trouble?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I wish you would tell the jury whether that crown-sheet was forced down or buckled enough to have caused it to have leaked by the scorching?

A. By the scorching?

Q. Yes.

A. I cannot tell; I think it probable that some of the bolts did leak, and it may or may not; it may have leaked at the time it was scorched and taken up afterwards, taken up immediately afterwards.

Q. Did you ever see a crown-sheet scorched to the extent [189] that that one was that did not leak?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What had been done to it to keep it from leaking?

A. Nothing.

Q. Why didn't it leak?

A. The water going into it carried some scale and evaporated and left the scale behind in the threads and closed them up.

Q. How long did it take to do that?

A. I don't know, the best evidence I could give was in one case the indications were that it had been scorched two or three weeks before I found it. I know that no leaking was ever reported on that engine.

Q. Do you know that it was not corked up?

A. It might have been corked out on the road; yes. I do not know.

Q. You don't know whether it leaked or not; all you know is that no leakage was reported?

A. It wasn't reported; it may have leaked.

Q. I did not ask you what had been reported. I asked you if you ever saw a crown-sheet scorched to the extent that that one was, over an area of 3¼ to 3½ feet one way and 4½ feet the other way, that did not leak?

A. I never saw a crown-sheet scorched at the time of scorching; I always saw it afterwards, and some time afterwards. That answers your question.

Q. And you never saw but these two that you have mentioned which you saw some time afterwards, that did not leak?

[190] A. Oh, I have seen quite a number that have been scorched and did not leak when I saw them; but I did not know the history of those. I simply remembered two cases in which—I expect three cases—where the evidence showed on examination that they had been scorched two or three weeks ahead.

Q. You don't know but what the bolts had been taken out in those cases and new bolts put in?

A. It could not have been done on the road without my finding it out.

Q. You don't know whether they were corked up out on the road or not?

A. No; I do not.

Q. Professor Randolph, how many crown-sheets did you ever know to blow down that had water on top of it, at the time that they were blown down?

A. I never followed up one; I never had a case of blowing down of the crown-sheet under my own jurisdiction. I have had cases of a bad failure of a boiler under my own jurisdiction, but what I have seen is examination of boilers on other roads, failures on other roads, and from what I could hear of them and get the information in that way.

Q. So that in your whole experience you have never known a crown-sheet to blow down when it had water on top of it?

[191] A. Well, no; that is, I want to get that answer correctly. I never knew the conditions sufficiently.

Q. That is what I mean. You are not able to come here and tell this jury that you ever knew of a single case where a crown-sheet blew down with water on top of it?

A. Or I knew the situation sufficiently to say that crown-sheet blew down under those conditions.

Q. Now, you say that a crown-sheet scorched over an area that this one was, and with a crown-sheet between the stay-bolt holes bent down to the extent that this one was might or might not leak?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If it did not leak it would be due to the fact that the spaces caused by the stretching of the crown-sheet, the opening of the holes,

had been filled up with something, that is correct, isn't it?

A. I think yes; in general cases. It is possible that it did not leak right at the start, but it is more than probable that the proper answer to your question is yes.

Q. I wish you would look at the front end of that drum there that is in front of you and tell the jury whether or not in your opinion that has been burned; that is, heated with no water on top of it.

[192] (Manuscript page 192 marked out.)

Plaintiff excepts.

A. Yes, sir; that has been hot.

[193] Q. How hot?

A. That center looks as if it has been a bright red; the sides a dark or dull red. I notice that the scale will scrape off, I can scrape a little piece off with my knife, as you see.

Q. Has it been pocketed in between those stay-bolt holes?

A. I do not see any signs of it

Q. You do not see any signs of it?

A. No, sir.

Q. The pocketing certainly is not as great as it is on that crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, as I understand your testimony, it does not injure a crown-sheet to heat it hot without any pressure on it, does it?

A. It depends on how hot, and whether a cherry or a bright red or a dull red; I do not think it injures it.

Q. As hot as that one has been heated?

A. I should not say that one has been injured very seriously.

Q. What causes a crown-sheet to leak from being scorched or burned?

[194] A. Usually the fit between the threads of the stay-bolts and the sheet is changed.

[195] (Manuscript page 195 marked out.)

Q. Now, I understand you to say, Professor Randolph, that the reason why you think that crown-sheet was burned previous to the accident is on account of the absence of the line of demar-

[196] cation or colorings that would exist if it had been burned at

the time it blew down, is that correct?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why do you say that that crown-sheet had water on it at the time it went down?

A. Because if it had not had water on it at the time of the failure it would have been very hot and there would have been a different color and condition of the surface of the sheet.

By the Court:

On which side?

Witness:

The fire side.

[197] Q. So then your reason for thinking that it did have water on it is that if it had gone down without water on it it would have a different color and a different kind of scale on the sheet?

A. If it had gone down without water it would have been a bright red or a white heat, which would have given a different color and condition of the surface on the fire side of the sheet.

Q. Is that your only reason for saying it went down with water on it?

A. That is the principal reason.

Q. You say it is the principal reason; didn't you say at the last trial of this case that was the only reason?

A. I do not remember what I said at the last trial. As I said before, I put that trial behind me and checked up the whole thing again and have gone all over it.

Q. All right. Now, I ask you again, if your only reason for saying that sheet went down with water on it is what you have stated?

[198] A. I said it is my principal reason and it is pretty nearly the only reason. There are other little things of minor details.

Q. In the absence of that principal reason and what you call practically your only reason, you wouldn't be able to say that that sheet went down with water on it?

A. Read the question.

(Question is here read to witness.)

A. If I could not see the sheet I could not tell anything about it.

Q. You think that answers my question?

A. I think that answers your question.

Q. You think there is nothing else about that sheet, about the coloring, that would enable you to say that sheet went down with

water on it?

A. Yes.

Q. What?

A. The form of the failures around the sides and corners there indicates that this bolt (indicating) pulled down, the sheet dropped down under pressure and then pulled this bolt down; in other words, it was a successive failure, bolt after bolt. These bolts pulling out like that indicates that, or this bolt (indicating No. 10), and there is another one here (indicating No. 9)—that bolt indicates that was pulled off this way (indicating).

Q. Would the coloring or the line of demarcation—

A. (Interposing.) What do you mean by line of demarcation?

Q. Between the scorched area and the area that was not [199] scorched, the appearance on the top side of that sheet.

A. You mean the water side?

Q. Yes.

A. There seems to be a little of the boiler scale, the lime scale, showing on the part that was not scorched; the failure of the sheet has broken off the rest of it, and leaves a reddish color.

Q. Professor Randolph, did I understand you to say that you could not tell how long this previous scorching had taken place prior to the failure?

A. I cannot tell.

Q. It might have been scorched three or four days before and it might have been three months before, you said; didn't you?

A. I said three or four hours, I think.

Q. How could you tell it was three or four hours before?

A. I was just thinking of that subject, studying that subject, to see whether that three or four hours should be—can you give me my reply to that question?

Q. It is going to take a long time to look for it.

A. If it had been two or three minutes it would have been a different proposition and there could have been more signs of rupture of the sheet than there are in this case.

Q. Suppose it had been a half an hour before?

A. If it had been half an hour before and the water had come back on the sheet to cool it, the conditions would be just about as we find them.

Q. So then, you cannot tell the jury whether it was a [200] day or an hour before or some time before?

A. The only way I could tell—the only thing that would give any evidence as to the time, is the length of time it would take

to get the water back on the sheet and cool it.

Q. Then any space of time that will enable you to get the water back on the sheet and cool it, would be sufficient time to elapse between the prior scorching and the failure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So the prior scorching might have occurred fifteen minutes before the failure?

A. That brings up the question of the length of time, and I do not think the water could be gotten back on that and cool it, had it been uncovered, that amount, in fifteen minutes.

Q. But you do think it could have been gotten back on there in sufficient quantity to cool it off, had it been scorched half an hour before?

A. Certainly three quarters.

Q. Didn't you say half an hour awhile ago?

A. One-half to three-quarters.

Q. You put it that way now, one-half to three-quarters?

A. About that time. You see the difficulty is how long would it take to get that water back, and without a calculation I cannot state.

[201] Q. You say if it had been three minutes before there would have been more signs of a rupture on the sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What signs would there have been?

A. It would have been torn out at the bolt holes; that is, there would have been cracks out from the bolt holes.

Q. The sheet would have been torn?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many crown-sheets have you ever seen that were blown down from absence of water on them?

A. I wouldn't like to say.

Q. I mean that were actually blown down; I am not asking you how many you have seen scorched.

A. I know; you mean where a sheet was hot and where it failed on account of that?

Q. Yes.

A. I do not remember; I should say twenty or thirty at least.

Q. When was the last time that you saw one that failed because it did not have any water on top of it?

A. The last one, I did not examine very closely; but it was about two or three months ago. I could just see the sheet from the railroad train as I passed.

Q. Where was that?

A. East of Montgomery tunnel.

Q. And you were passing by on the train?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you tell how much it was burned?

[202] A. It was twisted; and I saw one a couple of years ago.

Q. That had been blown down from low water?

A. Unquestionable, it was twisted.

Q. Where did you see that?

A. My recollection of that one, it was at Richmond.

Q. When did you see one before that?

A. The one before that I do not remember. The one before that was about fifteen or twenty years ago on the Baltimore & Ohio.

Q. How did you happen to see this one in Richmond?

A. I was passing along through the American Locomotive Works and they showed it to me.

Q. You made no particular examination of it, did you?

A. The sheet told me the story.

Q. How long have you been teaching at Blacksburg?

A. Twenty-one years.

Q. What have you had to do with locomotive boilers and crown-sheets of locomotives during that twenty-one years?

A. I have to study that subject and teach it, and in order to keep up on that I have had to keep more or less in close touch with the construction at our shops.

Q. Of locomotive boilers?

A. Locomotive boilers.

Q. At what shops?

A. The different shops I have been in.

Q. How often do you go to those shops?

[203] A. Possibly every year or two.

Q. And what shops do you usually go to?

A. Sometimes the American Locomotive Company's, sometimes the shops in Baltimore of the Baltimore & Ohio, and sometimes the Norfolk & Western shops.

Q. You said that the proper practice was to seat these button-head stays in the crown-sheet with a seating tool, or that was advisable, didn't you?

A. I do not think I said that. That it was very good practice especially, but if care was taken to put the bolts in properly so that they would make it seat properly, I did not think it was necessary always.

Q. So the only thing that you have seen of practical construction of locomotive boilers in the last twenty years is that you visited around at the various locomotive and railway companies' shops?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And examined them in that way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You testified in this case at Roanoke, I believe, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many days were you down there?

A. Four, I think.

Q. You came down there from Blacksburg to testify as an expert witness?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had not seen the crown-sheet or the bolts or any-
[204] thing about it when you came down there?

A. Not until after I got there.

Q. What arrangement was made with you about coming down there to testify?

A. I got, I think, a telephone message from Mr. Staples, asking me to come down.

Q. What compensation did you get?

A. My expenses.

Q. What was your arrangement as to the compensation you were to get for attending that trial?

A. No arrangement whatever.

Q. Do you mean to say that you left your classes at Blacksburg for a period of four days and went down to Roanoke without any arrangement being made for compensation for your testimony?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what arrangement for compensation has been made with you to testify here?

A. None at all.

Q. Do you always go as an expert witness on those terms?

A. I think most of the cases—no, sometimes—I do not think that question—I do not remember a single case where that has ever come up before the trial that I had any arrangement whatever; I cannot remember a case now.

Q. But you knew nothing at all about this crown-sheet
[205] when you went down there to Roanoke to become an expert witness in the case?

A. I knew nothing at all about it; I had never seen it.

Q. Did I understand you to say that these bolt heads indicate that they were burned to a bright or a dark red heat, or heated to a dark red heat?

A. That dark color in there, and in this side of that one and in some others, indicates that that fracture has been hot, that portion has been hot since the fracture or at the time of the fracture.

Q. So you would say that at the time of the fracture or since the fracture that bolt head has been heated to a dark red heat?

A. At the time of the fracture or since the fracture, that has been heated to at least a dark red heat.

Q. This is another one that you referred to?

A. Yes, all of those give this dark blue color; this one looks as if it was hot, it looks as if a portion of it remained hot and was broken afterwards; that I think is another one that has been hot since the fracture.

Q. Since the fracture?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So all three of these you would say indicate that they have been hot since the fracture?

A. Yes.

Q. And that they were not broken hot?

[206] A. They might have been broken hot; yes. They might have been hot when they were broken.

Q. To what degree of heat were they heated if they were hot when they were broken?

A. That does not look as if it had been over a dark red blue.

(The bolts referred to in the foregoing questions are numbered 2, 3, with dots, and one with the figure 9 on it.)

By the Court

Was that one of the bolts that was identified here, one of the twelve?

By Mr. Hall:

No, sir.

By the Court:

This wasn't found in the fire box?

By Mr. Hall:

No, sir.

A. I will add to that, this No. 9 looks as if it had been hardly

up to a dark red.

Q. So the one with the number 9 on it doesn't look like it was heated as hot as 2 or 3?

A. No.

Q. It doesn't look as if it was as hot or heated as hot as Nos. 2 and 3?

A. No, sir.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. If the heads of the bolts were cracked off and fell down in the fire, would that heat the bolts up?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Hall asked you about the size of the scorched area,
[207] Is all of the crown-sheet produced there?

A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. You do not know whether the part of the crown-sheet that they did not bring in here was scorched or not, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. That may have had bags on it too, may it not?

A. It may have, yes.

Q. These are what you would ordinarily term as bolt heads that were mutilated, all of these bolt heads are more or less mutilated?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How hot do you think a crown-sheet supported by the number and kind of bolts that crown-sheet is supported by, would have to be to go down from low water if all the bolts were in perfectly sound condition?

A. I think at least white hot.

Q. If it had been heated to that degree of heat, tell the jury whether or not the contortion and twisting of the bags wouldn't be different from what it is?

A. All that I have ever seen that have gone down were twisted badly and wavy and generally torn or ruptured.

Q. If the sheet followed tightly the contour of the depression on the bolt heads, and the threads of the sheet continued to fit tightly around the threads of the bolt, would that result in a leak around that bolt head necessarily?

A. If the threads on the under side of the head fitted
[208] tightly, would it result in a leak, is that your question?

Q. Yes.

A. No, not if they fitted tightly.

Q. You said you have not seen any crown-sheet that you have been familiar enough with the circumstances under which the failures occurred to state positively that the failure had been from causes other than low water. I will ask you whether or not you have seen crown-sheets prior to this one which in your opinion failed from causes other than low water?

Defendant objected. Overruled. Exception.

A. I think I stated before, or I will state now, that I do not remember ever having seen prior to this one a crown-sheet which I was sufficiently familiar with the circumstances to say that
[209] it had failed from causes other than low water.

(Witness stands aside.)

[210] JERRE WALTON, RECALLED.

Jerre Walton, recalled, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Walton, I neglected to ask you when you were on the stand to tell us about the grade of this road at the point of the accident. Can you tell us what grade was there?

A. It was about level, I suppose.

Q. About a level grade?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[211] G. W. MITCHELL.

G. W. Mitchell, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Mitchell, you live in Christiansburg, I believe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your business is that of an insurance agent, I believe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Life insurance?

A. Writing life insurance.

Q. Have you, as such agent, a standard table of mortality, a

mortuary table?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. A table showing the expectancy of a man's life from experience basis?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. For any age given?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. For whatever age it shows his expectancy?

A. Yes, sir; starting with the age of twenty.

Q. I wish you would please state to the jury what the expectancy of a man's life is at the age of 38.

By Mr. Wingfield:

One minute, please. What company issues that table that you are talking about?

Witness:

It is compiled by—

By Mr. Wingfield:

Let us see it.

Witness:

It is compiled by all the old line insurance companies; it is the American experience table of mortality.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Do the old line insurance companies insure railroad engineers?

Witness:

They have different rules about that, most of them do on an endowment policy.

[212] Q. They do not issue an ordinary life policy on engineers, do they?

A. No, sir; that is, some of them do at an increased rate.

Q. How about the National Life of Vermont, that seems to be the one you represent?

A. They won't issue anything under a twenty year endowment on railroad engineers.

Q. And then they charge them an increased premium, don't they?

A. Yes, sir; they write a twenty-year endowment.

Q. And that is the only form of policy they will issue on railroad engineers?

A. Yes, sir; that is the cheapest form they will write, ten-year or fifteen-year endowment, but not ordinary life or twenty pay life.

Q. The reason for that is the occupation of an engineer is more hazardous than that of an ordinary man, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir; it is considered so.

Q. And this table that you have here is made up of the [213] expectancy of the average man in good health, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Now, will you please tell us the expectancy of a man at the age of 38 as shown by the experience mortality tables, the American Experience Mortality Table?

A. Age 38, did you say?

Q. Yes.

A. It would be 29.62 of a year.

Q. It is close on to thirty years?

A. Yes, sir; practically 29½ years.

(Witness stands aside.)

[214] J. F. SMITH.

J. F. Smith, sworn, for Plaintiff:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You live in Roanoke, I believe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are a brother-in-law of Mr. Andrews, the gentleman who was killed by this accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have known him for how long?

A. Ten or twelve years.

Q. I wish you would state to the court and jury whether or not he was a man that provided for his family?

A. Yes, sir; he always provided well as far as I know.

Q. Will you tell the jury whether or not he was a father that looked after and cared for the education of his children?

A. I have always known him to be such that way, I believe.

Q. What kind of a man was he around the house; did he do things around the house that was necessary to be done?

A. Yes, sir; he was always useful around the house at home.

and attentive to his home.

Q. What about his health?

A. I always thought he had excellent health; I never heard of him being any other way, but a very healthy man. He used to have little headache spells or something like that occasionally, but not very often.

No cross-examination.

(Witness stands aside.)

Plaintiff rests in chief.

[216] DEFENDANT'S EVIDENCE IN CHIEF.

B. O. YEARWOOD.

B. O. Yearwood, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What is your line of work?

A. At the present time?

Q. Yes.

A. Machine shop foreman.

Q. What were you doing at the time the engines were built in which engine 469 was included in the order?

A. Inspecting material.

Q. How many engines were built at that time along with No. 469?

A. Ten, I believe.

By the Court:

Is No. 469 the number of the engine here?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir.

Q. Where did you inspect this material?

A. At the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. Were these engines built by the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any tests or see any tests made of the stay-bolt material that went into these engines?

A. Yes, sir?

Q. I wish you would tell the jury what it tested.

A. I couldn't say just off-hand, but we have the test sheet here.

Q. Tell the jury how those tests were conducted and [217] what the tests showed.

A. We took a standard test of a piece of standard bar material the same as went into the stay-bolts and pulled it in the testing machine, the physical test.

By Mr. Staples:

You mean the same material that was actually put in engines was pulled?

Witness:

Yes, sir; the original bar; some of the same material.

By Mr. Staples:

Part of the same bar?

Witness:

Part of the same bar that went into the engine.

Q. What did they show?

A. It showed an elastic limit—

By Mr. Staples:

One minute. He is testifying from some memorandum and I would like to see it.

By Mr. Hall:

Very well; just show it to Mr. Staples.

Witness:

This is the original sheet.

This is a copy. What was it gotten from?

Witness:

Sheets that were made right at the testing machine in the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

By Mr. Staples: What part did you play in the tests?

Witness: I witnessed the tests made.

By Mr. Staples: Is that all you did, just stood there and looked at it?

Witness: I helped to make out some of the test sheets; yes, sir.

[218] By Mr. Staples: You did not make any of these sheets?

Witness: No, sir; but I witnessed them being made out after the test was made and the material was pulled.

By Mr. Staples: Did you actually check these figures on this sheet?

Witness: I have; yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples: I mean, did you do it at the time?

Witness: In a short time afterwards.

By Mr. Staples: How long afterwards?

Witness: The same evening.

By Mr. Staples: What did you check them by?

Witness: By making the calculation.

By Mr. Staples: By making the calculation?

Witness: Yes, sir; and we have the direct reading on the machine for a part of it, the bolts and tests machine.

By Mr. Staples: Did you make this copy; who made that?

Witness: One of our boys that makes the tests, handles the test machine.

By Mr. Staples: Did you compare this copy with the original?

Witness: Yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples: When?

Witness: At the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

By Mr. Staples: When?

Witness: On the date that the test was made.

By Mr. Staples: When was this copy made?

[219] Witness: I think about the 27th.

By Mr. Staples: 27th of what?

Witness: February.

By Mr. Staples: And the test was not made until the 29th; what day was the test made?

Witness: The test was made on the same day.

By Mr. Staples: The test was made on the 27th then, and this here shows the 29th.

Witness: That 29th is a mistake.

By Mr. Staples: If the test was made on the 27th, it was not until two days later?

Witness: That was made on the same day that is dated.

By Mr. Staples: I thought you said the test was made on the 27th; have you any recollection of those tests independent of these figures?

Witness: I have some; yes.

By Mr. Staples: Could you state what they are without these figures?

Witness: Part of them. The elastic limit ran about 24000, I think, or somewhere in the neighborhood of that, and the breaking strength and square inches about 50,000—48,000 to 50,000.

By Mr. Staples: The breaking strength you think was 50,000?

Witness: Near 50,000.

By Mr. Hall: I think he has examined the witness enough to test his competency.

By Mr. Staples: I want to test the witness' recollection.

By the Court: He has answered a number of questions, and there is one question I did not quite catch as to this being a copy. Have you compared this copy with the original on your books?

Witness: I compared it at the time; yes. They make out a copy and make out the original and copy at the same time with carbon and they gave me the copy and kept the original.

By the Court: And this is the copy they gave you?

[220] Witness: One is.

By Mr. Wingfield: This is a carbon copy of the original.

Witness: One is and one is the original.

By Mr. Staples: That is not a carbon copy of that.

Witness: That is made out with a pencil, sometimes they are re-copied when they just make out the original sheet.

By Mr. Staples: You don't know who made this copy?

Witness: One of the Baldwin Locomotive Works men made it.

By Mr. Staples: Mr. Shinn.

By Mr. Staples: Did you check over every figure on here with the original?

Witness: Yes, sir; I believe I did.

By Mr. Staples: Are you positive of that?

Witness: Yes, sir; I am.

By Mr. Staples: What made you do it?

Witness: To see if everything was correct and we were getting proper material that we wanted to go into the boilers.

By Mr. Staples: You could look at the original without looking over the copy, couldn't you?

[221] Witness: Yes, sir; they gave me a copy.

By Mr. Staples: You went there and checked over each of these figures with the original; do you mean to tell this jury you did that?

Witness: Most of them, not all of them.

By Mr. Staples: Who checked the balance of them?

Witness: All of them weren't checked.

By Mr. Staples: And you think from your personal recollection that the breaking strength was 50,000 pounds?

Witness: Between 48,000 and 50,000; somewhere along there.

By Mr. Staples: If this says from 40,000 to 41,000 pounds, it is not in accordance with your recollection?

By Mr. Hall: I do not think this is time for cross-examination.

By Mr. Staples: Then we object to the witness testifying from that sheet.

By the Court: Do you offer that sheet for the purpose of refreshing his memory?

By Mr. Hall: Yes, sir.

By the Court: Go ahead.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination.

Q. What were you doing at the Baldwin Locomotive Works; what was your duty there?

A. Inspecting material and the workmanship of the engine.

Q. Who were you employed by and who were you sent [222] there by to inspect the material?

A. By the Virginian Railway Company.

Q. How long did you stay there?

A. Until the order of engines was completed.

Q. What inspections did you make, just in a general way?

A. I seen the material tested in the physical machine, almost all of it.

Q. Did you inspect the workmanship in these engines as they were being built?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, what did the test of the stay-bolt material show as to its strength?

Q. Did you have a copy of the specifications for the strength of the stay-bolt iron that was to go into those engines?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did all of those materials test up to the specifications?

A. Very near all of them; yes, sir.

[223] Q. I wish you would please refresh your memory by looking at that sheet and tell the jury what strength the test showed the stay-bolt iron to have?

By Mr. Staples:

Which stay-bolts? If your Honor please, I think the question ought to be limited to the iron that went into this engine.

By Mr. Hall:

I mean the stay-bolts that went into all ten of these engines.

By Mr. Staples:

They are different.

By Mr. Hall:

I cannot pick out each particular stay-bolt that went into ten different engines.

By the Court:

I understood the witness to say that the same material went into all of these engines. Didn't you say that?

Witness:

The first ten engines, the material, all of it, I believe, came in at the same time or very nearly so, and was tested practically at the same time.

By the Court:

And this engine now under consideration was one of the first engines?

Witness:

Yes, sir:

By Mr. Staples:

I would like to ask him another question as the basis of an objection. In what form did the iron come?

Witness:

Just in bars from the rolling mill.

By Mr. Staples: How long were the bars?

Witness: I suppose about 12 feet; I did not measure them—12 to 16 feet.

By Mr. Staples: How many bolts would one of those bars make?

Witness: Five or six, I suppose.

By Mr. Staples: How many bolts are in that boiler there?

[224] Witness: I just don't remember how many are in there.

By Mr. Staples: Do you mean to tell this jury that a test was made of every one of those bars as recorded on those sheets?

Witness: One bar was taken out of every lot.

By Mr. Staples: You tested one bar out of so many?

Witness: Yes; that is the regulation for testing.

By Mr. Staples: Then the bars you actually tested, those identical bars were not used, were they?

Witness: Yes, sir, they were used; not the test pieces, but the balance of the bar was used, the balance of the heat.

By Mr. Staples: You tested one bar in how many?

Witness: I suppose the heat would make different number of bars, sometimes 16 or 18 in a heat.

By Mr. Staples: What do you mean by a heat?

Witness: A billet, so many bars rolled from one square billet.

By Mr. Staples: And you tested one bar and the balance of them you would not test?

Witness: Yes, sir.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. All of the bars that were rolled from one billet of iron, were all together, were they not?

A. They came in that way to the locomotive works, and were

numbered.

Q. And you took one?

By Mr. Staples:

We object to the answer to that previous question unless the witness can state that he knew these bars came in one pack and that they were rolled from one piece of metal I do not think he ought to be allowed to testify to the fact.

By the Court:

Let me get the point of your objection, Mr. Staples.

By Mr. Staples:

He says that these bars would come in there in bundles, about 16 to a bundle; they would take one bar and test it and wouldn't test any more, and then he said all were rolled from one billet.

By the Court:

What do you mean by one billet. As I understand it, these bars came in there in bundles.

Witness:

So many were shipped in so many lots.

By the Court: You took one of those bars out of so many?

[225] Witness: Yes, sir.

By the Court: And tested that bar?

Witness: Yes, sir.

By the Court: And if it came up to the standard—

Witness: (Interposing.) We accepted it.

By the Court: And you accepted that particular bundle?

Witness: Yes, sir.

By the Court: If it did not come up to the standard you rejected it?

Witness: We rejected the whole lot in that heat.

By Mr. Staples: Do you know of your own personal knowledge that all of the bars in that particular bundle came out of one heat?

[226] Witness: I did not follow them from the rolling mill.

By Mr. Staples: You don't know whether they actually did or not?

Witness: We only take the miller's word for that.

By Mr. Staples:

Then we object to his testifying to that fact because it is just hearsay.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepts.

By the Court:

Q. As I understand, this iron was ordered from the factory or somewhere else?

A. From the rolling mill or manufacturers.

Q. And it came there a number of bars packed up together or tied up together?

A. And kept separate for test purposes.

Q. And you took one of those and tested it and if you found it all right you used all the rest of that bundle?

Yes, sir.

Q. If you found it wrong you did not use any of them?

A. That is right.

By Mr. Staples:

What I object to is the witness stating that all of the bars of one of those bundles were made of the same heat or came from the same billet.

A. One billet from the rolling mill; they rolled a number of small ones out of one large one.

By the Court:

Your objection is that you don't know whether all the bars in that roll were prepared at the rolling mill at the same time?

By Mr. Staples:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. How did those bars show that they all belonged to the same heat, as you call it?

A. By being stamped on it.

Q. What was that stamp on it?

A. They have different stamps on them.

Q. I mean did they have the temperature at which they were rolled stamped on them?

A. No, sir; just the number to identify them.

Q. A serial number?

A. Yes, sir; a serial number.

Q. Are you familiar with the custom of inspecting material in locomotive works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you become familiar with it?

[228] A. From practical experience at the works.

Q. How long?

A. I guess I have been inspecting engines up there off and on ever since 1906, as much as ten or eleven months at a time.

Q. Did you see how the inspection is carried on, not only for your engines, but for all other material that comes to the locomotive works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the customary way of doing it, to test one bar of the same serial number?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, in making those tests of the stay-bolt iron, I wish you would please examine your sheet and also the specifications under which those engines were built, and state whether or not the strength of that material came up to the specifications.

A. Our specifications here call for 49,000 to 52,000

[229] pounds tensile strength per square inch, and here it tested to 51,640 pounds, and this is within the limit.

By the Court

Is that blue print what you call the specifications?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

[230] Q. Is that blue print the paper that you carried up there with you when you went?

A. That is the exact copy made from the same tracing, and the Baldwin people have a copy of it and I have a copy of it with me to go by.

Q. And your specifications required 48,000 pounds, did you say, tensile strength per square inch?

A. From 49,000 to 52,000 and this is within that limit, it is 51,640 pounds, and it tested within the limit, or I would have rejected it.

Q. If it had been below 49,000 pounds, would you have allowed it to go into those engines?

A. If it was a small per cent and showed a good reduction in area and a good elongation, I would, for it would have been perfectly safe.

Q. Now, from your experience in testing and handling stay-bolt iron, I wish you would please tell the jury whether that was a high quality of iron or not, for the purposes for which it was used?

A. From the experience I have had in testing stay-bolt iron at the Baldwin Locomotive Works, I would consider that first-class iron, for it shows a good reduction and a good elongation.

Q. How about its tensile strength?

A. It is good, 51,640.

Q. Did you accept any that was below 49,000 to the [231] square inch?

A. I do not remember that I did.

Q. Does your record show that you accepted any under that?

A. It does not; no, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

Have you got a record of all the tests that were made?

Witness:

I believe it is in the particular engine; yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples: Engine 469?

Witness: Yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples: How do you identify that with 469?

Witness: This covers the whole lot of stay-bolt iron for that number of engines, and here is the mill number and here is our test of the pieces.

By Mr. Hall:

If your Honor please, we must insist that they do not interrupt our examination; this is the third or fourth time they have done so with this witness.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. Did you test the crown-sheet iron?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did your specifications require in that?

Q. You haven't got the specifications for the crown-sheet there,

have you?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you got a test of the crown-sheet iron that went
[232] into that engine?

A. I do not happen to have my copy of it; I think I turned that into the office.

Q. You have two sheets there; does either one of them show the test of the crown-sheet iron?

A. No; neither one of these two.

Q. I will not stop and look for it now, but I will produce it by another witness. I wish you would look at this sheet and state whether or not that shows the test of the crown-sheet iron?

A. (After examining said paper.) Yes, this shows the test of it.

Q. What does that test show?

A. It shows 52,630 tensile strength per square inch.

Q. What tensile strength did the specifications require, if you know?

By the Court:

Does he know anything about that paper?

By Mr. Hall:

It has got his signature to it, I suppose he knows.

A. In the per cent of elongation two of the tests of specimen was 30.5.

Q. How is that? Does that test show good material?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that as good as can be gotten for crown-sheets?

A. As far as I have ever inspected any, it is first-class.

Q. My question was, what strength did the specifications
[233] require. If you haven't got the specifications there before you with reference to the crown-sheet, I will leave that question for the present and ask you whether or not—

A. (Interposing.) Yes, sir; I have it right here.

Q. All right; state what it requires.

A. Not less than 52,000 and not more than 55,000, and our tests of the specimen ran here 52,630, within the limit.

Q. Now, after seeing that material tested that went into this engine, did you inspect the workmanship of it?

A. Only a part of it.

Q. What part of it did you inspect?

A. Just in a general way I inspected the machinery.

Q. You did not inspect the boiler part of it, the crown-sheet and the stay-bolts, after they were put together?

A. No, sir.

Q. That inspection was made by somebody else, was it?

A. By our boilermaker.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Are those bolts heated when the engine is built?

A. Yes; in a forging machine.

Q. That might or might not injure them, might it not?

A. It might be overheated.

Q. If they were overheated it would take the tensile strength out of them?

A. To a certain degree.

[234] Q. You say you made it a custom to allow material to go in that did not come up to the specifications?

A. In a good grade of iron that runs just slightly less, maybe a couple of thousand pounds; all right; and I think, if I remember rightly, the Baldwin Locomotive Works was allowed to run as low as 45,000 pounds by our former superintendent of motive power, Mr. Sanderson, and our specifications were changed and instead of 49,000 the limit was 45,000.

Q. Do you mean that you allowed them to go as low as 45,000, under those specifications there?

A. Not that I remember of.

Q. Were you instructed to allow them to depart from the specifications if you thought advisable?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you do that in violation of your instructions?

A. I did not go below the instructions I had from the superintendent of motive power, and they still held good at the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. I am talking about these times that you did go below, did you do that contrary to your instructions or not?

A. No, sir; not that I know of.

Q. Did you do it in accordance with your instructions then?

A. There was no instructions issued outside of the specifications.

Q. Then you violated your instructions if you allowed

[235] them to depart from them?

A. We had the specifications that was agreed to at the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. And you allowed them to depart from those specifications?

A. No, sir; not below 45,000.

Q. Didn't you tell the jury a little while ago you did allow them to go below, when the holding power was good?

A. Below 49,000?

Q. I am talking about those specifications that you hold in your hand?

A. I have in some cases, yes; but I do not remember in these lot of engines.

Q. Now, the tensile strength of the bolts and of the crown-sheet is practically the same?

A. Yes, sir; they run somewhere along about the same.

Q. If the bolts are in good and perfect condition and the crown-sheet in good condition, they both should stand about the same amount of strain before they would give way, is that right?

A. I couldn't say; that depends a whole lot on the construction.

Q. If they were properly constructed, I mean.

A. The shape that the sheet is would have something to do with that, I think.

Q. I am talking about the pressure that they will stand, the shape of the sheet does not have anything to do with the pressure the bolts would stand.

A. It should have; the shape it is in, I think.

[236] Q. It might have something to do with the pressure that is exerted but not with the capacity of the bolts?

Q. You have to take it as an individual.

Q. Then the crown-sheet and the bolts ought to stand about the same pressure, ought they not?

A. Well, they both test practically the same.

Q. That is what I mean. Now, what per cent of the material that went into those ten engines did you test?

A. All the stay-bolt iron and all the fire box steel and all the shell plate.

Q. You mean you tested every bar that went into it?

A. No, not every bar; we only tested a speciment out of each heat.

Q. Then you tested one bar out of each bundle?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And there are fifteen other bars in there that you did not test?

A. There isn't any one that tests them all that I know of.

Q. Then no man can be absolutely certain that some of those fifteen other bars may have been in a bad condition, but that is the best you can get at from your test, isn't that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What percentage of the raw material that came in did you test; not over 6 per cent of it, did you?

A. Something like that I guess, 6 to 10.

[237] Q. And then 94 per cent of the material that is in that crown-sheet yonder is made out of bars that have never been actually tested, or bolts I mean, isn't that correct?

A. The balance of the lot wasn't tested, of course.

Q. After this material that you saw tested was tested, what did you do?

A. After the material was tested at the testing machine?

Q. Yes; what did you do then?

A. The material was passed and they worked it up into bolts and used it.

Q. What did you do; I am not talking about what other people did, but where did you go after that was done?

A. I stayed right on the job.

Q. On what job?

A. The building of the locomotive.

Q. I thought you said somebody else attended to that?

A. I mean I was there around the engine when the engine was being built; I was inspecting the machinery on the engine.

Q. You couldn't follow up the building of three or four or five engines there; you couldn't follow up and track this material into the engine, could you?

A. No, sir.

Q. You did not try to do that, you trusted to the company to use the material which you saw?

A. And to our boilermaker to see about that.

Q. You trusted to the boilermakers and to the employees [238] of the company to do that?

A. Yes, sir; that is the customary way.

Q. Whether or not they might have substituted other meterial for the material you saw tested, you don't know and couldn't possibly know, isn't that correct?

A. No, we have no exact way of telling.

(Witness stands aside.)

[239] J. C. SHINN.

J. C. Shinn, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Where do you live?

A. In Germantown, Philadelphia.

Q. Are you employed by the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been employed there?

A. Since June, 1911.

Q. In February, 1912 did you make any tests of material that went into the ten engines in which No. 469 was included, for the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What material did you test that went into that engine?

A. As far as I know, only the stay-bolt material; I do not remember anything else.

Q. How did you test that stay-bolt material; just describe the manner of making the test?

A. One bar is selected from every bundle and from that one bar a piece about 12 inches long is cut off and that is marked off into an eighth inch section in inches, and then that is put in the test machine and pulled, and in that manner the tensile strength of the material is gotten, and then after the tensile strength is gotten the bar is placed together, the broken ends placed together, and it is remeasured, and we find out how much it has stretched, and from that we get the elongation, the percentage of elongation of the material.

Q. Do you make any other test of it besides that?

A. On this material we get the reduction of area, we measure the broken end of the bar to find out what ampere it was, how much it has been reduced, and we also put the bending test on the material.

This bar, about sixteen inches long, was taken and first bent
[240] in the center flat on itself cold, it had not been heated at all, and it was taken and bent the other way flat on itself so that there was two bends, each at right angles to the other of the material.

Q. What did your test show as to the tensile strength of that stay-bolt material?

A. It showed that all of the material tested was very good material, and within the specifications.

Q. Do you know what it actually showed; I mean have you got a record of your tests?

A. Yes, sir; I have it here. For tensile strength per square inch in pounds, it shows 51,640 for the first piece and the lowest piece is 50,760.

Q. What size manufacturing plant has the Baldwin Locomotive Works? Does it build a large number of engines or not?

A. Yes, sir; a large number. It employs about 18,000 men, generally.

Q. Does it rebuild engines for the leading railroads of this country and for foreign countries?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury how the strength of
[241] that material that went into the stay-bolts in these engines compares with the strength of stay-bolt material that is required by other leading railroads in the country.

By Mr. Staples:

We object to that question. We think the witness ought to show his familiarity with the requirements of other railroads before expressing an opinion of that kind.

Q. You test material for building engines for all the railroads in this country, don't you?

Plaintiff objected. Objection sustained.

Q. What experience have you had in testing material for stay-bolts for engines for the leading railroads in the United States?

A. I was in the testing department for about a year and a half, and a large majority of the material that is not tested by the railroad companies' own inspectors is tested up there.

Q. And during that time were you testing material for all the different railroads?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, answer my previous question as to how the strength of the material that went into these stay-bolts compares with the strength of material used and required by other railroads?

Plaintiff objected.

By the Court:

The witness stated how he tested the iron that went into the stay-bolts in these ten engines?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

You further stated, I think, that you were in the testing department for about a year and a half?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

And that during that year and a half you tested iron that went into the stay-bolts of other railroads frequently?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

That is what I understood him to say.

By Mr. Staples:

He did not state that he tested the iron that went into this locomotive; he tested one little piece out of a bundle.

[242] A. So far as I remember, sir, it compares very well.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. How do you spell your name?

A. S-h-i-n-n.

Q. How many of those bolts or pieces were put up in bundles?

A. As far as I know, I think there were from fifteen to twenty in a bundle.

Q. Fifteen to twenty in a bundle? And how long were those pieces?

A. I think they were fifteen feet.

Q. And you tested a piece eight inches off one end of one piece, is that right?

A. We took 12-inch piece from the end and marked that off in eight inches.

Q. 12 inches instead of 8 inches?

[243] A. Yes, sir.

Q. You took one foot of the fifteen feet out of the bundle of twenty, is that right?

A. Yes, sir; approximately.

Q. You only took one foot of the fifteen feet out of a bundle of twenty, that is what you say?

A. Yes, sir; we took them promiscuously.

Q. In other words, you tested 15 per cent of one piece of the 20-bunch lot or less than 1 per cent of the bundle?

A. That was our usual custom.

Q. And that is what you did in this case. The test you made there was less than 1 per cent of the raw material used, wasn't it?

A. About.

Q. Don't the requirements of all big companies require as much as a 2 per cent test of the material used; isn't that a fact?

A. I do not remember.

Q. You do not remember whether that is true or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. How old are you?

A. Twenty-one.

Q. And you began testing there when?

A. In June, 1911.

[244] Q. When did you begin to work for the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. At that time.

Q. Then along about the first experience that you had in testing iron of any kind was on these engines, wasn't it—just along about the very first?

A. It was some months afterwards.

Q. It couldn't have been very long because the engines were shipped here in July, 1911, weren't they?

A. Apparently the Baldwin people thought it long enough.

Q. They might have been right about that; but what I am getting at is this: those engines were shipped here in July, 1911.

By Mr. Hall:

They were not built until February, 1912.

Q. When were those engines shipped here?

A. I don't know. I have nothing to do with that.

Q. As a matter of fact, when you test the piece of iron you go off and leave the whole batch that you think that came out of and you do not have anything more to do with it?

A. No, sir.

Q. As to whether that iron is used, you haven't any more idea than a man in the moon, have you, from your own knowledge?

A. No, sir.

[245] Q. As to whether any part of the iron you ever tested went into this engine is something that you have not and cannot passibly have any idea from your personal knowledge. That is true, isn't it? It is bound to be true, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir; that is true.

Q. You don't know anything about the specifications or their requirements for this shipment, do you?

A. That was a part of what I was supposed to know.

Q. Do you know now what the specifications were?

A. For tensile strength and pounds per square inch, if I remember correctly, they ran 48,000 to 52,000; the elastic limit was 50 per cent of the tensile strength. The elongation was to be 26 per cent in eight inches, and the reduction of area was to be 40 per cent.

Q. You and Mr. Yearwood were there testing at the same time, were you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever meet him?

A. Yes, sir; I met him there.

Q. You all did depart from those specifications at least down to a test of 45,000, didn't you?

A. Not according to this report.

Q. Just leaving that report out of consideration for the present, don't you know, as a matter of fact, it was the practice there to do it?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you deny that it was?

A. I say I do not know.

[246] Q. You don't know much about this anyhow, do you, except the fact that you made some tests up there shortly after you went with the Baldwin people. That is all you know about it?

A. I made the test of this iron and the tests were within the Virginian Railroad's specifications.

Q. Less than 1 per cent of the material was used, one foot in three hundred, less than one-third of 1 per cent was your test, wasn't it?

A. It was our general custom.

Q. That is the test you made in this case. Stand aside.

(Witness stands aside.)

[247] R. L. BOWDEN.

R. L. Bowden, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What line of work do you follow?

A. I am a boilermaker.

Q. How long have you been a boilermaker?

A. About twenty-five years or a little over.

Q. Tell us in a general way where you have worked as a boilermaker?

A. I have worked in Norfolk about nine years in the marine shops in building steamboat boilers and all classes of work and all classes of boilers, including locomotive boilers, and then I worked in the railroad shops for something like seventeen years.

Q. Were you engaged in boilermaker work during all that time of seventeen years on locomotives?

A. For the last sixteen, about seventeen, years I have been in locomotive shops, altogether.

Q. Who were you employed by in February, 1912?

A. By the Virginian Railroad.

Q. Did you go up to Philadelphia to inspect ten engines that were built at the same time when engine No. 469 was built?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury what test you made of those engines; in the first place I wish you would tell whether you watched the workmanship on those boilers, and inspected them as they went along?

[248] A. That was my business up there, to see and follow up the workmanship and inspect the work as it was performed on those engines.

Q. How long did you stay there?

A. I went there in March, from March, I reckon, up until June.

Q. Did you have anything else to do during that time except inspect the boilers and the workmanship on those boilers?

A. No, sir.

Q. How were they built, were they properly built or not?

A. Yes, sir; they were well-built boilers.

Q. How about the crown-sheets and the stay-bolts, were they properly put in?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any test of that before they were taken away from there?

A. Yes, sir; after the boilers were completed I would go over them while the work was being performed until it was all completed, and of course, the rivets and the corking I tested with a feeler to see that the iron was all right, and the rivet head was put properly, and also the crown bolts that had heads to them, I tested them in the same way I did the rivets, with the feeler to see that the head was put to the sheet all right.

Q. What is that that you call a feeler, describe it.

A. It is a piece of metal gotten down; it is about, I think,
[249] the one that I used there, was six one-thousandths or something like that.

Q. Six one-thousandths or six one-hundredths of an inch?

A. Yes; six one-hundredths—just as fine as you could scale. And after the boilers were built they were sent to Eddystone to be assembled with the engines.

Q. Where is Eddystone? What do you mean by that; the jury do not understand that?

A. That is a little different shop from the one the boilers were erected in.

Q. The boilers are erected in one shop and then they are sent to another shop, are they?

A. To another depastment or another shop, to be assembled on the frames, and there they were washed out and cooked out with soda and tested by steam.

Q. Tell us about cooking them out with soda. Why is that done?

A. We cook them out in order to clear them of grease or any oil that would go in while they were drilling or tapping the stay-bolts.

Q. Is it necessary to use oil in drilling the stay-bolt holes?

A. They use oil in drilling and in tapping the holes, you know, to protect the tap.

Q. Does that sometimes deposit some grease around the stay-bolts?

A. The grease will run through inside; somewill of
[250] course naturally drop from the tap, and that is why we cook them out with soda to destroy the grease.

Q. Does that do it?

A. Yes; it leaves them in a pretty nice, dry condition when it is all over.

Q. How do you boil them out with soda or steam them out with soda; what do you do?

A. We put soda in the boiler and then boil the water in the boiler.

Q. You boil it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. After you get through with that, did you get into these boilers and examine them to see whether they were cleaned out right or not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any grease left on the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. Any scrap material or anything of that kind left on it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, describe your water test that you put them through after the other tests.

A. After the steam test we put them to a test of 285 pounds of water.

Q. 285 pounds?

A. Yes, sir; to see if there is any leak or defect in any way about the boiler.

Q. Is that above steam pressure or below it?

[251] A. It is above steam pressure.

Q. Why did you make that water test of it?

A. Why did I make it?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. To be sure that the boiler is properly built and has the proper strength to hold the steam pressure, as a factor of safety.

Q. What is the steam test? How high do you increase the pressure in that?

A. I think we run that steam test up to 220 or 240, I disremember. I haven't got any of the tests with me.

Q. Up to 220 or 240?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the pressure carried on the boiler when it is in service?

A. Its working pressure is 200 pounds and the steam test is 220 pounds.

Q. You mean that it is built for 200 pounds?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it always carry that much in service?

A. No, sir; we carry on that class of engine—we have been carrying 185 and 187 pounds; that is what we set the pops at, we have two pops, one set at 185 and the other at 187.

Q. Now, did this engine 469 stand both of those tests all right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If there had been any defect in the boiler or any weakness in the material that could not stand a pressure of 185 pounds,

[252] would it have shown under those two tests?

A. I should say it would.

Q. Now, when did you inspect this engine 469 again?

A. I don't know for sure when she was inspected; they had our inspectors there to inspect it once each month.

Q. Did you inspect this engine after the failure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was present when that inspection was made?

A. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Slayton, and I wont' be sure whether Mr. Houston was there at that time or not, and the Interstate Inspector.

Q. That is the United States Government inspector?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you find when you inspected it then?

A. I found the crown-sheet was down and the bolt heads had pulled off and I just found the engine as you see the sheet there; it showed that the bolt heads had been hot and also the crown-sheet.

Q. Were any of the bolts broken anywhere except at the heads?

A. No, sir.

Q. Right under the heads?

A. No, sir.

Q. I wish you would state whether or not the bolt heads on the entire area of that sheet that has been forced down by the explosion—this is, all of the bolts that failed in that explosion—were the heads of all of them pulled off right in the heads of the bolts?

A. Yes, sir.

[253] Q. Were any of the stay-bolts at all broken?

A. Every head was pulled off.

Q. What condition were those stay-bolts in when you made that inspection?

A. The stay-bolts were in perfect condition, only right at the ends where they were pulled off; they showed a little pull right on the ends there, and also showed the heat for about an inch and a half up

the bolt; it was discolored for about an inch and a half, at least the coloring of the head had run up into it, a blue color, on the bolt, and it colored a little on the end as it pulled off, just like a hot piece of iron would do.

Q. What does that blue color indicate that runs up on the bolt about an inch or more?

A. It indicated that the bolt was heated and the heat gradually ran up the body of the bolt.

Q. Did that show on the stay-bolts over the entire broken area?

A. Yes, sir; some of them wasn't as high up as others, some of them only just showed a very short place, and others were up about an inch and a half.

Q. You mean the color did not extend up on all of them the same height?

A. No, sir.

Q. On which end of the sheet did it extend up further?

A. Why, down along the front end there was where it [254] looked the hottest.

Q. Is that the highest part of the sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the part of the sheet that is first exposed when the water gets low?

A. Yes, sir; that is the part that is connected to the flue sheet, and the flue sheet supported that end up on the flue sheet and that is the highest end of the crown-sheet, supported underneath by the flue sheet and the crown-bolts above.

Q. What portion of the front of that sheet where it is supported in front had pulled loose?

A. The flue sheet itself came down with it but never broke loose from the flue sheet, the flue sheet doubled over with it as far as it was heated, down to the first row of flues.

Q. What experience have you had in handling boilers; I mean handling burned crown-sheets—that is, crown-sheets that have been heated to a hot heat without water on top of them?

A. I do not think so. I never seen any that indicated being dry.

Q. Read the question. I do not think you understood me.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. I never seen any but what was heat without water on it.

Q. You do not hear well, do you?

[255] A. No, sir.

Q. My question is, how long have you been doing the

kind of work that brings you in contact with burned crown-sheets?

A. I have been in it for the last sixteen or seventeen years.

Q. Have you seen many crown-sheets that have been burned?

A. Yes, sir; I have seen a good many, but not very many for that extent. I have seen one burned a good deal worse too, where it came down to the fire box, but I have seen many a sheet that was burned slightly.

Q. Have you seen many sheets that were burned to the point of failure?

A. Every one I have ever seen burned at all was a failure to a certain extent.

Q. It was a failure to a certain extent?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You mean part of it went down?

A. I have seen them burned so that it did not go down; I have seen them burned; I have known them to be fired up with no water and there would be no pressure and did not show any indication, no pocketing or anything of that kind, because no pressure there to do it. Of course, it would make the boiler leak and we corked them up on that account, and I have seen them burned and just scorched, a little pocket maybe, just enough to notice it. Of course, I have
[256] never seen it that way but what it did not leak, and so if it pocketed much we had to renew the bolts.

Q. You say you have never seen but one sheet that had as much area on it burned as this one?

A. No, I don't know as I ever saw but one that went down any lower than that.

Q. How do you account for this one holding long enough for that area to be burned?

A. From my experience I would say that this sheet got hot first, being its thinnest part, and the water got off it, got down to that level from the looks of it and the water was off the sheet just that far, as far as we could see it bent down there, and the sheet being thin that heated up first, and the bolts, there was more stick in the bolts than there was in the sheet, it taken them a little longer to heat, and of course the pressure started to show down between the bolts after that was heated. That is my theory and experience in boilers that have been burned; and then as the bolts gradually got hotter they became weaker until they finally weakened to such an extent that they could not hold the pressure and they dropped, and by doing that it made an impression around the holes on the sheet.

Q. Now, if that sheet had been burned and the threads pocketed

between the bolt holes, as you see it is pocketed, I wish you would tell the jury whether it would leak or not.

A. Yes; I have never seen any one burned to that extent that did not leak, not in my experience.

Q. What has to be done with them when they are burned
[257] that way?

A. Whenever they are pocketed that much we have to renew the bolts.

Q. Can you operate an engine that is pocketed that way?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because it would leak so that you couldn't keep water in there and the engineer couldn't handle it.

Q. Now, what was done with this engine when it was brought into Princeton, or from the time it was brought to Princeton until the Interstate Commerce Inspectors came?

A. That engine was run up into the shops where we put a curtain around it to keep any one from getting around there until the Interstate Commerce Inspectors came down there.

Q. You fastened it up, did you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recognize these bolt heads as being the ones that were picked up there when you brought that engine to Princeton and made this inspection.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were they?

A. They were down in the ash pan and around over some of them on the grate and about in the fire box.

Q. I want to ask you this question, in your experience of twenty-five years in boiler making, did you ever see bolt heads pulled off like that when the crown-sheet had not been burned?

A. No, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You are employed by the Virginian Railway now?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been working for the Virginian?

A. I have been there a little over seven years.

[258] Q. Where did you work before you went there?

A. For the Seabord Airline.

Q. How long did you work for them?

A. I worked there nine years.

Q. Who did you work for before that?

A. I worked at different places. I worked for a contract shop in Alabama, and I worked in Selma, Alabama, for the Southern Railway.

Q. Has your hearing got any better in the last few minutes?

A. No, sir; I do not think it has got any better.

Q. You heard me when I asked you those other questions all right, didn't you, when I was talking over there and asking you these questions as to where you worked, you heard me all right, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you examined this engine it was cold, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It wasn't hot when you got to it, was it?

[259] A. No, sir.

Q. What do they mean by an engine being buckled or a boiler being buckled?

A. What I would call buckled or pocketing would be between the stays; that is, bulged down.

Q. It is not an uncommon occurrence to see an engine buckled, is it?

A. They do if they get heated enough.

Q. You see it quite often, don't you; you have seen many a one?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have seen them come into your own shops on their own steam, haven't you?

A. I don't know about that. We had one that came in there that had been scorched, under its own steam.

Q. They do use them occasionally, and you have seen them at work on the road after what they were called buckled?

A. This one came in there but never brought any train; but he brought the engine in.

Q. The engine came in and it held water, didn't it?

A. He brought it in to be worked on.

[260] Q. That was the one that Mr. Keezer brought in?

A. Who?

Q. Mr. Keezer.

A. No, sir; I don't remember him bringing it in.

Q. Do you remember the engine that Mr. Keezer was supposed to have burned?

A. This engine that I speak of was 429.

Q. I don't know the number, it may be 4029, I don't know the number of it; but don't you remember the engine that Mr. Keezer was charged with burning for the Virginian Railway? Do you or not?

A. No, sir; I do not remember it.

Q. You told us this then, that one engine that was buckled came into the shop under its own steam, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir; of course, it wasn't buckled to any extent; it was scorched enough to make it leak.

Q. It was buckled some?

A. Only two places, between two stay-bolt holes, that you could discern it was done.

Q. Well, there was some buckled?

A. A little bit.

Q. You say you were up in Philadelphia when these engines and boilers were constructed; you did not do the testing of the iron, did you?

A. No, sir.

[261] Q. And don't know anything about that?

A. No, sir; I never tested iron.

Q. You were there to supervise the construction?

A. I was only to inspect the mechanical work as it went on, as the engines were built.

Q. Had you ever done any work of that kind previously for the Virginian?

A. No; I never done any inspection for them; that was my first trip up there.

Q. You did not drive these bolts in yourself, or did not put them in?

A. No, sir.

Q. You let the other men wear the overalls on those occasions, didn't you?

A. They all wear overalls, I think.

Q. You were not there while all of the bolts were put in, were you?

A. I had an assistant there; he was on at night time and I was on in the day time.

Q. And at least you did not have an opportunity to see more than one-half of them, did you, your assistant being on at night and you in the day?

181

A. I did not see over one-half of them put in, I do not suppose; I could not state just how many.

Q. How many engines were they building at one time?

[262] A. We had ten.

Q. Under contract at one time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they were being built around at different parts of that great big shop there, weren't they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And no living one man could see all of the bolts that went in there if he was sent there for that purpose?

A. It would be a hard matter to see them run every bolt in.

Q. Wouldn't it be a physical impossibility for one man to watch the driving in of the bolts of ten boilers at one time; how could he do it, Mr. Bowden?

A. One man couldn't see that; he couldn't see them put all of them in.

Q. He had just as well have been in Princeton as far as seeing each bolt was concerned?

A. But I inspected them after they were put in.

Q. Your inspection was after the bolts were really put in, wasn't it?

A. Of course, I saw a good many put in, but I don't say that I saw all put in.

Q. You saw a powerful small percentage put in?

A. I saw one-half or more than one-half, I suppose.

Q. More than one-half of the bolts in each of those ten engines, when you were only on half the time and they were constructing ten boilers at once?

A. They weren't putting the bolts in all the time; they

[263] had one engine advanced further; they were doing a certain class of work on one engine while they were doing another class on another.

Q. You didn't watch anything but the putting in of the bolts?

A. Yes, sir; I done all I could.

Q. Could you be there watching these other ten engines while they were working on the other engines, and watch them put in the bolts; you couldn't do that?

A. Of course, I couldn't be in two different places at one time.

Q. Of course not; the law of physics wouldn't permit you to do that.

A. In regard to the building of those boilers I started to say; when they are building boilers they advance one ahead of the other all the time and they finish them up one at a time, and then we would run one out today and maybe tomorrow we would run another one out that way, until they finished them all.

Q. And you had the same thing to supervise during the entire time of the construction of the ten engines, didnt' you?

A. I would go down into the shop and go over what work was done, the riveting and things of that kind that was done on the boilers at night, or what my young man had left off, that was down there with me; I would go over them and then follow them up until [264] I got up to the last boiler they were working on.

Q. You would see the work after it was done and some of it while it was being done?

A. I saw part while it was being done; I didn't see all of course.

Q. You didn't see anything like half?

A. It wasn't far from it.

Q. Where was it you said they assembled the parts together at?

A. In the Eddystone shop, a different shop a little ways out of Philadelphia City; it is a new shop they have got there.

Q. While they were assembling the parts together at Eddystone were you there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were they working on these boilers, the ones that had not been finished back in Philadelphia, while they were assembling the parts at Eddystone?

A. They sent them down to Eddystone to be assembled to the frame, and they lay there until they got all the frames and material ready for assembling.

Q. While they were assembling the engines at Eddystone, were they working on parts of these ten engines back in Philadelphia?

A. They might have had a few in Eddystone before they finished the last ones in Philadelphia.

Q. And you sure couldn't be in Eddystone and Phila- [265] delphia at the same time, could you?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, you said after they assembled them together they washed them out with soda?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who did that?

A. The man in charge at Eddystone.

Q. How much soda would he put in them?

A. As well as I remember they put from eight to ten pounds.

Q. You don't know how much soda they put in?

A. Somewhere about eight or ten pounds to the engine.

Q. You were not inspecting the work, were you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You didn't tell them how much soda to put in?

A. No; I couldn't tell exactly now how much; I did know, but I never kept no memorandum of it.

Q. And you don't know how much was necessary, do you?

A. I put in as much as I thought was necessary.

Q. You didn't fill it up?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, while they were cooking it out with soda, where were you?

A. I was there in the shop.

Q. There in the shop while they were cooking it or in Philadelphia?

A. I was there where they were cooking the engines out; [266] I witnessed the test out there.

Q. How many of these engines did you see cooked out with soda?

A. I saw the ten we had built down there.

Q. Did you see all ten cooked out with soda?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you went into that boiler after they were cooked with soda?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you go into it?

A. They taken the dome cap off and I went in on top.

Q. And that let you down into the crown-sheet?

A. That lets you down on the flues, and then we taken out all the wash-out plugs and arch pipe plugs and all the plugs in the boiler.

Q. That did not let you down on the crown-sheet?

A. Yes; that lets you down on the flues and you go to the crown-sheet.

Q. You told Mr. Hall there were no scraps or waste material left on the crown-sheets of any of those boilers, didn't you?

A. None of that lot; no, sir.

Q. Do you recall one of that lot of engines that went down with water on the crown-sheet, in the yard at Princeton, due to the

fact that there was waste material left on the crown-sheet, and that you all opened it up there and found waste material?

A. Yes, sir; I remember that we had one that got a
[267] scorched spot on it from borings on the crown-sheet, but that wasn't in that lot of engines; it was a later lot of engines we had built.

Q. What was the number of that engine?

A. 473.

Q. Do you say that engine 473 did not come with this shipment of ten engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, when was it that that engine went down?

[268] A. What engine?

Q. The one that burned on the yard with water on the crown-sheet, in the yard at Princeton?

A. No. 473 got a scorched spot on the crown-sheet right over the fire door, pretty near, a little to the right of the center, and it was detected from the bolts leaking.

Q. When they discovered it had gone down from waste material and stuff left on the crown-sheet, didn't they go into the other engines of that same shipment?

A. They found that engine leaking and they went in and inspected it; we taken all the plugs out and—

Q. (Interposing.) If I am not talking loud enough I will talk a little louder.

By Mr. Hall:

Let him finish his answer.

A. We found some sediment of borings that had lodged on the sheet, a spot of it around, and we taken out, I believe we taken out six bolts out of that engine.

Q. Which failed on you on the yard, with water over the crown-sheet, didn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Didn't you just now say that you never had seen a crown-sheet that had been scorched except one that did not have water on it; did you say that or not?

A. If there is sediment on the sheet enough that the water don't get on the sheet—

Q. (Interposing.) Will you please answer my question?

[269] Did you or not tell Mr. Hall that you never had seen a

scorched or burned crown-sheet when there was water over the crown-sheet?

A. I said on the sheet.

Q. You said on the sheet? Is that what you said?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is perfectly possible then for an engine to be scorched and burned full of water, is it?

A. If you have got anything to keep the water away from the sheet it is bound to burn.

Q. After you all discovered those scrapings and borings were in that engine, didn't you go into this very engine that failed here and examine it for scrapings and borings?

A. Which one?

Q. What is the number of this engine that failed?

A. This one there?

Q. The one that had that crown-sheet in it.

A. That was 469.

Q. Did you go into that one?

A. I went into that one and inspected it thoroughly.

Q. After this failure at Princeton yard?

A. No, sir.

Q. Before that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the only time you went into that engine, at the point of manufacture?

A. Yes; and I know there was no borings in it when I [270] went in it and inspected it personally myself.

Q. This engine 473 which failed on the Princeton yard had been submitted to the identical inspection and treatment that engine 469 had, hadn't it?

A. I couldn't tell you; I wasn't there when it was built.

Q. Now, please tell me, after this engine was burned, in the yard at Princeton, whether you did not go in most all of your engines and inspect them to see whether there was any borings on the crown-sheet?

A. I went in all of the last lot that came in; yes, sir. We taken them and opened them.

Q. Didn't you go into the other lot also?

A. I don't remember about that.

Q. Didn't you go in and inspect the very lot you inspected in Philadelphia; didn't they do it?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Do you say they did not?

A. I never did.

Q. I am not talking about you; but wasn't it done at your shops and don't you know it was done?

A. Not to my knowledge, not the old engines were not.

Q. I mean the engines that were in the shipment with the lot of 469, the engine that went down while Mr. Andrews was driving it.

A. I remember having all of the engines that came in the last lot gone through after we found that this one had a scorched place on it, but I do not remember of going through any others.

[271] Q. The engine that was driven by Mr. Richardson, who has testified in this case—Mr. F. A. Richardson, you know him, don't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He drives one of the engines that came in this lot, with the lot of ten that this engine came in, doesn't he?

A. I don't know what engine he has got now.

Q. I mean the engine he had in 1912, in November, 1912.

A. I couldn't tell you what engine he ran then at all.

Q. Didn't you, after you found these filings and scrapings on the crown-sheet of engine 473, didn't you go into the engine that Mr. Richardson drives and wasn't that engine one of this lot that came with 469?

A. I couldn't say; I don't know what engine he was running.

Q. You don't know whether that is true or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. You say that the crown-sheet, in your judgment, over here got hot, except the bolts?

A. The bolts got hot too.

Q. For how far up?

A. It showed on the bolts about an inch and a half, the last shade of the heat was about an inch and a half.

Q. Now, weren't the heads of those bolts heated when they were put in, in the construction of the engine?

[272] A. The bolts were made—yes, they were heated when they were made in the machine, but they did not heat them to put them into the engine.

Q. Didn't you have to cut off that socket at the end of those bolts about that long (indicating)?

A. No, sir; as a general thing they are nicked and screwed up until they are tight enough and until that twists off.

Q. This thing here you mean (indicating)?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they screw them up until that twists off?

A. We generally have a nick around there, leave enough stuff there to hold.

Q. And you screw that until this end twists off?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you do not have to heat it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Who was the engineer on 473?

A. I don't know who was running that engine at that time; I couldn't tell you.

Q. Have you any way you could tell me?

A. I could find out by looking over the roundhouse reports; that is the only way I know of.

Q. That is the only way you can give me the information on that subject?

A. I don't keep any records along that line.

[273] Q. You know whose engine that was that burned in the yard; that was common knowledge among all of the men, wasn't it?

A. No, sir; I couldn't tell you who was running it at all.

Q. You never heard?

A. If I did I don't remember.

Q. Now, you say this sheet in your judgment was hot, and that is the reason it went down?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Bowden, what is the effect of bolts that are screwed in the sheet, if the bolts pull out, what effect does that have on the threads in the sheet, if it is pulled out while the sheet is hot?

A. It would depend on how the sheet had stretched and how much the holes had stretched before it pulled out. Now, if the heated bolt or stay bolt will pull out of the sheet, it generally destroys the thread on the bolt when it strips through; I never seen any pull out that way, only these crown-bolts, is the only thing I ever saw pull out and the heads pull off.

Q. This accident here is the only one you ever saw where the heads pulled off?

A. The only bolt heads I ever saw pulled off except one or two where the engines had been heated. I saw an engine once that broke off two bolts from being heated, only broke two bolts.

Q. And if I understand you correctly, this crown-sheet

failure is the only one that you ever saw wherein the head of the bolt pulled off that way, is that true or not?

A. The only one I remember—no, I remember one com-
[274] ing all the way down, and it pulled all the bolt heads off.

Q. Where was that?

A. On the Seaboard.

Q. When was that?

A. It has been several years ago.

Q. They didn't have any button-heads then, did they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was it?

A. I couldn't tell you; I don't remember the date; but it was while I was working for the Seabord Air Line Railroad.

Q. You haven't told me about the effect it is bound to have on the threads of the sheet if the sheet is hot, if it is red hot; what effect would it have on the threads in the sheet?

A. It depends on how much the sheet would stretch, and if the bolt head itself would not support the sheet until it pocketed down; it might stretch the holes so large it wouldn't touch the threads at all.

Q. The heat wouldn't let it get away from there until it pulled the head off?

A. The holes could enlarge.

Q. The holes would lay there and stretch because it
[275] couldn't get by the bolt heads?

A. The head could hold it and if the sheet was to get very hot and heated right quick.

Q. Until the head pulls off that part of the sheet up against which the head is, that cannot get by, cannot sag down until the head comes off or the bolt parts one, can it?

A. That is the way I spoke of it, to pocket down, the iron stretches when it comes down between the bolt holes and—

Q. (Interposing.) I am not talking about that.

By Mr. Hall:

But that is what he is talking about.

A. Whenever it comes down between the bolts it is bound to enlarge the hole and leaves it less. That is a matter of practical experience in crown bolts that have been burned, that they enlarge the holes and leave the threads not holding, while the head of the bolt will hold in there unless they get heated to such an extent that they become so weak they cannot hold the pressure.

Q. Now, coming back to my question. That part of the plate

immediately above the bolt head, that cannot sag down until the bolt head gives way or until the bolt one gives way, can it?

A. No, sir; not right under the bolt head, that will hold just as long as the bolt head will hold it up there, of course.

Q. Now, then, if that cannot give way until the bolt head
[276] gives way, when the bolt head does give way what effect is that bound to have on the threads in the sheet, if the sheet is hot?

A. That wouldn't necessarily have any effect on the threads if this bolt fitted the bolt tight enough for the bolt to destroy the threads.

Q. If it fitted the bolt tight what effect would it have on the threads in the sheet?

A. If it fitted the bolt tight it wouldn't pull down if the threads held it.

Q. It would strip, wouldn't it?

A. I never saw them stripped with the head on.

Q. I said the head had given away and there is nothing in the way but the threads; I say what effect will it have on the threads in the sheet when the head gives way from the bolt and there is a failure of the crown-sheet?

A. If the crown-sheet was hot—of course if it got hot enough the bolt head would come off after the bolt head got hot, the pressure would let that down.

Q. Let's get off the bolt head and go back to the thread. What effect would it have on the thread in the crown-sheet?

A. It wouldn't effect the thread if the hole had expanded enough to get away from the bolt.

Q. If the hole in the crown-sheet fitted the bolt and it had not stretched, what effect would it have on the thread in the crown-sheet?

A. If it was pulled out?

[277] Q. Yes, sir.

A. Cold?

Q. No, we have been talking about a hot sheet so long I thought you knew that. I said when the sheet—

A. (Interposing.) I never saw a bolt that the thread fitted after the crown-sheet was once heated.

Q. Now, please, Mr. Bowden, the sheet that I am asking you about is a sheet which you say was hot. I am not asking you about any cold sheet. The hole that I am asking you about is a hole that fits the bolt. The threads I am asking you about are the threads in the crown-sheet. I asked you that if the head of that bolt pulls off and the bolt with the threads on it pulls out of the crown-sheet while

the crown-sheet is hot, what effect is it bound to have on the threads in the crown-sheet?

By Mr. Hall:

We object to the question because the witness has just answered the question by saying they never fit up when they are hot.

By Mr. Staples:

Let the witness protect himself, Mr. Hall.

Q. The Court says that you can answer my question.

By the Court:

If you do not understand the question the stenographer will read it to you.

A. Well, please read the question.

(The question is here read to the witness.)

A. It wouldn't have but very little effect on the threads in the crown-sheet.

Q. Why?

[278] A. For the simple fact that the hole would be expanded so much that the bolt would not destroy it.

Q. My question to you is predicated upon the idea that the hole in the crown-sheet is not stretched. Get that in your head; it is predicated upon that one idea that the hole in the crown-sheet is not stretched. Now, I ask you if it pulls out what effect must it have on the threads in the crown-sheet?

A. I couldn't answer that question, because I never seen a bolt pull out of a crown-sheet that fitted tight that was hot, and I cannot answer the question.

Q. Is it possible to heat a crown-sheet unless you heat the bolt or that portion of the bolt that is in the crown-sheet?

A. Of course, if you heat the crown-sheet you will heat the bolt too.

Q. The hole in the crown-sheet gets larger upon the theory of expansion, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What does that bolt do, while the hole in the crown-sheet is expanding? Does the bolt stay there and hold its hold or expand also?

A. It expands also but not as much as if the sheet pockets.

Q. Suppose the sheet isn't pocketed, how about it?

[279] A. Then I do not think they would pull out.

Q. That is the question I am asking you about.

A. I never seen one that did pull out.

Q. You never saw an instance of that kind, and if there are any holes in that crown-sheet the bolts would fit in now—

By Mr. Wingfield:

(Interposing.) He never said that.

By Mr. Hunt:

I asked him that.

A. I never seen a bolt out of this crown-sheet that the crown-sheet wasn't pocketed between the bolts.

Q. If that is the way you insist on answering, I am going to drop it at that. Mr. Bowden, where are some of those long bolts that were in that boiler beside these two here?

A. Some of them are at the shop.

Q. In the scrap pile?

A. Some of them are along in the shop there, just on the ground, laying on the shop floor.

Q. Why didn't you bring those here?

A. I didn't think it was necessary, I don't reckon.

Q. What did you do with some of those bolts?

[280] A. I haven't done anything, only I had them taken out

Q. What did you see anybody else do to them?

A. Nothing.

Q. Have you been the custodian of those bolts?

A. Part of them that has been in the shop all the time

Q. Have you been the custodian of these two that were brought in here?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Up until when?

A. Until I turned them over to Mr. Slayton.

Q. When was that?

A. I had them sent to his office, I believe; maybe a week ago.

Q. Why did you let them lay out in the weather and rust that way?

A. Because I did not think they would be of any service, and some of them were used up as material—all that was long enough as being good material, we used them up, the blacksmiths did.

Q. You didn't preserve them and you never attempted to preserve them for evidence in this case, did you?

A. No, sir; not after they were taken out, we did not.

Q. Who gathered up the bolt heads?

A. I gathered up a part of them and I suppose Mr. Slayton

and Mr. Lewis might have picked up some; I know two or three of us picked them up in the fire box.

Q. Which ones did you gather up?

A. I couldn't tell you.

[281] Q. As a matter of fact, you couldn't tell whether you gathered up a single one of those, could you?

A. Not all of them, I couldn't tell whether I gathered them up.

Q. I didn't ask you about all of them, I asked you about any one that you gathered up.

A. I gathered up some of the lot; I couldn't identify any regular bolt that I picked up.

Q. Now, if you couldn't identify the nut and bolt or head that you picked up, how do you know you picked up any of these; you may have picked up others, but how do you know you picked up any of these?

A. We saved all that we picked up in the fire box.

Q. Who is we? Did you pick up and save a single one of those bolts there out of engine 469?

A. If that is all we had in the box, I did.

Q. Regarless of whether it is all he had in the box, God knows I will never know. Did you pick up and save a single one of these bolt heads that are laying on that table; you don't know, do you?

A. Not unless I knew—I saved part of them that he had there in that little box. I couldn't say I picked all of them up, because I picked up a part of them.

Q. Can you swear under your oath that you ever saw either one of these bolt heads before this trial?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which one did you see?

A. All of them.

[282] Q. Where?

A. In the shop. I kept them in my office for several months.

Q. You kept them in your office?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know they are the same ones?

A. I kept them there and I turned them over to Mr. Slayton and he kept them there and then they were marked.

Q. How do you identify a single one of those bolt heads?

A. They have got a mark on them.

Q. What mark is it?

A. There is a chisel mark right there (indicating).

Q. Now, hasn't that mark been put on these bolt heads since the last trial of this case, in Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, that being true, that the mark which you identify the bolt by, knowing that you saved and preserved it as a mark and it has been put on since it left your possession, how can you identify it by that mark?

A. We put the marks on there when they were taken out of the box, and they were sealed in the box again and kept in his office.

Q. That was after the trial in the Federal Court in Roanoke, wasn't it? You know that is true, don't you?

A. These are the bolts that were picked up.

Q. You still believe they are, do you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Bowden, these were an inch and an eighth [283] bolts in this sheet, weren't they?

A. Inch bolts.

Q. An inch and an eighth?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are stronger than an inch bolt, aren't they?

A. They would hold more pull; yes, sir.

Q. They would hold eight times as much, wouldn't they?

A. No.

Q. Wouldn't they hold that much?

A. No, sir.

Q. How much more would they hold?

A. I don't know; I couldn't say.

Q. Then how do you know they wouldn't last eight times as much?

A. I know they wouldn't hold that much.

Q. And you don't know how much more they would hold?

A. They would hold some more.

Q. If you don't know I don't want you to guess.

A. I couldn't say.

Q. Who did you say was with you when you inspected this boiler at Princeton?

A. Mr. Lewis.

Q. Which Mr. Lewis is that?

A. S. H. Lewis.

Q. Who is he and where does he stay?

A. He is the assistant superintendent of motive power.

By Mr. Hall:

He is here in the court room.

[284] Q. Mr. Houston, is he here?

A. I think Mr. Houston was present.

Q. Is he here in Christiansburg?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Slayton I know is here because I know him.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many of those bolts were in that crown-sheet?

A. I couldn't tell you unless I looked at it.

Q. Don't you know from a boilermaker's experience the number of bolts that are in it?

A. There was twelve rows of button-heads bolts or them crown-bolts.

Q. How many to the row?

A. I don't know exactly; I believe there was about—I couldn't say to be positive about it, right up to the bolt.

Q. There were a thousand or more bolts or 1200 bolts in that crown-sheet, weren't there?

A. I don't think there was that many?

Q. In the whole crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. How many of those bolts, when you inspected that engine, were broken; what percentage of the bolts were broken; nearly all of them, weren't they?

A. The heads were pulled off of all of them we have; it had gone down?

Q. How hot do you think the sheet was?

[285] A. I couldn't say how hot it was, but it must have been pretty hot.

Q. Doesn't your experience—you are put on here as an expert boilermaker along this line—wouldn't your experience enable you to form an opinion how hot that sheet was when it failed?

A. I couldn't say, but from my judgment it must have been pretty good and red for it to have been that weak, or it had been hot some little time for the bolts to have gotten that weak.

Q. Or it could have been heated before?

A. I don't know as I—

Q. (Interposing.) If it was heated before—

By Mr. Hall:

Wait a minute. Let him finish his answer.

Q. Do you want to say anything more, Mr. Bowden?

A. How was that last question?

Q. I don't know. Read the question to him.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

Q. If you want to answer any more go ahead.

A. What I was going to say, I don't know as that would have had any effect on the bolts if it had been previously heated—on the bolts at this time.

Q. You don't think it would have had any effect on the bolts at all if it had been previously heated?

A. Not their coming off, unless it had been heated again.

[286] Q. What difference would it make in the mark you say is on that bolt, running an inch and a half up, whether that had been hot thirty days before, one day before, a week before or a year before? What difference would it make in the color of that mark that you have told this jury about? It wouldn't make any, would it?

A. Not at the time, if you inspect it right. If it was heated it would show the same temperature or would show the same color.

Q. If you inspected it a year afterwards it would show the same thing?

A. No, sir.

Q. How long afterwards?

A. You can take any piece of iron and heat it and work it and—

Q. (Interposing.) We are not working this; we are just heating it and saving it.

A. That is my experience.

Q. If that piece of iron is kept free from atmospheric exposure, as it is kept in the inside of the boiler, would it make any difference in the color marks whether that heat had been applied there one hour, twenty-four hours or thirty days before?

A. Yes, sir; the color wouldn't stay on the inside of the boiler.

Q. On the inside of the boiler?

A. No, sir.

[287] Q. Why?

A. Because it would have recoated with sediment from the water.

Q. How long does it take to recoat?

A. Not very long.

Q. Give us some idea. That is one question we have been trying to find out in this case, how long?

A. I suppose—that would depend on the conditions of the water altogether.

Q. Now, I am speaking about the water such as the engines and boilers of the Virginian Railway drink, that water?

A. There is times when the water we have there would color it very quick, at least mud would get around it and sediment.

Q. Mud would get around the bolts?

A. And sediment from muddy water.

Q. And that would accumulate on the bolts and aronnd the bolts until the color would be absorbed by the mud, is that your idea?

A. Until it would cover the coloring.

Q. Was there any mud on this, or in that boiler?

A. It didn't show any to any amount, only this coating on all the bolts and on the seats.

Q. There wasn't any mud to bother the color?

A. No, sir; not when I inspected it.

Q. What else would bother it?

A. I don't know anything that would change that color.

Q. You cannot tell me anything else would change the [288] color except mud, and the mud did not change it?

A. It don't look like any mud ever got on it since it was heated.

Q. Now, go back and tell the jury the appearance of that color, whether it would have made any difference, whether it would be on there twenty-four hours or thirty days or a year previous.

A. If the engine runs any after it had been heated that coloring on the bolts would have been covered with sediment.

Q. What kind of sediment?

A. A covering of sediment that is in the water.

Q. What kind?

A. Any kind—mud or lime or anything that gets in the boiler.

Q. Now, I am going to ask you to give this jury some idea how long it would take to deposit mud or lime sediment or whatever you are talking about on this crown-sheet and around the bolts to such an extent as it will change the color of a burned bolt?

A. I do not think it would take more than a few hours to put enough on that, if the engine was in use, for to change or hide the burned or heated color on the bolts.

Q. When mud sediment and stuff will get on it—

A. (Interposing.) It will hide the heated covering of the bolts.

Q. Wouldn't that same sediment and mud check up the little leaks in the boiler?

A. If it is not washed in proper time it finally would, if [289] enough settled on it to do that.

Q. If it will in a few hours cover up a bolt so that you cannot see the color of it or on it, how long would it take to check a small leak around the bolt? Would it take a year to do that?

A. It don't take but very little to hide the coloring of the heat on the bolt.

Q. You just put that on like paint, I suppose. Do you mean to say it would take just a few hours to cover up a bolt so as to change its color and would take a long time to check up a small leak around the bolt by that same sediment? Is that what you tell the jury?

A. I say it won't take long to cover the coloring of a heated bolt on the inside of the boiler if it was in continuous use.

Q. It is a cinch that according to your theory, at least, if that bolt or those burned bolts got into your hands nothing could change the color of them then, could it? I mean after they got into your hands?

A. Nothing.

Q. But the atmospheric conditions of the weather?

A. That is all.

Q. If you kept them out of the weather they would look the same way, wouldn't they?

A. If they were kept or preserved right they would preserve that color.

Q. Can you look at a burn or a piece of iron and tell [290] when it was made?

A. No, sir. You mean tell when the burn was made?

Q. Yes.

A. No, sir. I can tell it was burned; that is what I understood you to say.

Q. No. My question is: can you look at it and tell when it was burned? Can you look at those burned bolts and tell when they were burned?

A. I could tell that they were burned previous to the time that I looked at them.

Q. Of course, or there wouldn't be any burn there. But could you or any living man tell that jury when they were burned?

A. Certainly not.

Q. That is what I have been trying to get at.

A. In an hour or anything of the kind, do you mean?

Q. You don't know when they were burned?

A. No, sir; I couldn't tell the hour it was burned at all.

Q. These bolts an inch and an eighth in diameter and made of this elegant material, with the big button-heads on them, how long would they remain at red heat with 185 pounds pressure in the boiler before they would give way?

A. I couldn't tell you that. They have got to get hot enough to lose strength enough so that 185 pounds of pressure would push them off. No, I couldn't tell you how hot they would have to be to get to that stage.

Q. You can look at that sheet and tell it never was more
[291] than a red heat, can't you?

A. I cannot say that; I cannot say how hot. I know it wasn't hot enough to begin to pit away or fall apart; but I cannot say how hot it was.

Q. It would do that at a white heat, wouldn't it?

A. No, sir.

Q. What heat would do it?

A. It has got to be burning hot, when you get a white heat; if you go much higher then it would begin to burn and drop away.

Q. If it went to a white heat it leaves iron scale on it, doesn't it?

A. Yes; it will leave a scale on it, at any heat; it depends on conditions in heating, has always been my experience. You can heat a piece of iron in a furnace both sides get hot it looks as if it don't scale as much as if you were to expose one side to the air.

Q. What I am trying to get at is, you can look at a piece of iron and tell whether it has ever been to a white heat, can't you?

A. I don't know as I could after it got cool. I can tell it has been heated, but I couldn't tell you just how hot it has been.

Q. Don't it leave a different color if it is heated to a white heat than if it is heated to a red heat?

A. I could not tell you whether it would or not.

[292] Q. Will you look at the off side of this base drum and tell me whether this side was heated and how hot in your judgment was it heated?

A. I will look at it but I won't be able to tell you how hot it was heated. (Witness examines drum.) That has been heated, it shows to me a red heat but there I couldn't tell you how much hotter.

Q. You know it got to a red heat?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You tell that from this reddish oxidation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you look and see if there is any on that sheet at all. (Witness examines the sheet.) Did you find any of that red oxidation on the sheet?

A. Not to any extent, it don't show the same color as that.

Q. Was that heated with water in it or out of it?

A. I cannot tell you.

Q. You can heat it with water in it?

A. It may have had water in the drum, you couldn't heat it with the water on that head.

Q. I asked you if there was water in it. There was bound to be on the head if they heated it from underneath.

A. It has two heads.

Q. Did you ever see anything stand on its head and get heated? They don't stand it on its head and heat it from the other side?

A. It can be done.

[293] Q. Are you fixed up in your shops so you can do those stunts?

A. I couldn't tell what position it was in when it was heated, or when it was heated.

Q. If it was heated with this head down, can you tell me whether there was any water in it?

A. If there was any in the drum?

Q. By the law of gravity, if you turn a thing upside down, the water would go to the bottom?

A. It couldn't have been heated from the bottom with water in it.

Q. Didn't you say a moment ago you didn't know whether it could be or not?

A. Yes, sir. I don't know which end was up or what position it was in.

Q. In other words, you cannot tell from the appearance of it whether it was heated with water in it or not, can you?

A. I cannot tell how hot it was; I don't know in what position; if there was water in it. It wasn't heated with water on that head, in my judgment.

Q. Can you tell us, looking at that and assuming it was setting up in the right shape, if it was heated? Can you tell us whether that was heated with water on it or not?

A. Which end down?

Q. That end down (indicating).

A. If it had water in it enough to cover the head it
[294] wasn't heated with water in it, you couldn't heat it with water enough on it.

Q. You state that, do you?

A. Yes, sir. You couldn't heat it with the water standing over that head there sufficiently to keep it covered.

Q. How else could they heat it unless they stood it with that end down?

A. You could heat it with that end down (indicating.)

Q. And built a fire on top of it?

A. Yes, sir; you can do that and heat it as far as that is concerned.

Q. You could?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think you could build a fire on that and heat it to a red heat?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. With water in it?

A. Yes, sir; build a fire on top of it, if that was half full of water, or anything like that, and turn it up on the end and build a fire on the top end, it would heat.

Q. You could do it by building a fire on top of it?

A. Yes, sir; on the head the water don't touch.

Defendant objected.

Q. There is no other way they can heat it, is there?

A. There is no way to heat it as long as water stays on
[295] that head; you would have to heat the head the water wasn't against.

Q. How hot can you get a piece of iron with water lying directly on it?

A. Hot enough to boil the water and finally evaporate it.

Q. To what degree of temperature can you get it?

A. I guess about—I don't know.

Q. Don't guess, if you don't know say so.

A. I don't know how many degrees.

Q. You don't know?

A. No, sir.

Q. How hot does it get to boil? You don't know that either, do you?

A. I couldn't tell you how hot a boiler would be if it was fired, how many degrees hot it was.

Q. At what degree of temperature will it begin to make steam?

A. I couldn't answer that.

Q. You are an expert here on the question of heat, and you don't know what the boiling point is?

A. I am a practical boilermaker.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You were asked several questions about engine 473 and you stated that that engine was scorched, the crown-sheet of it was. Did that crown-sheet blow down and did the engine fail?

[296] A. No, sir.

Q. To what extent was the crown-sheet of engine 473 scorched?

A. It was scorched enough to make the bolts leak, two or three of the bolts seemed to be a little bit loose in the holes, so they were leaking very bad.

Q. How many bolts leaked and how many bolts were replaced when it was repaired?

A. I think, as well as I remember, we put in six bolts in it, but I won't be positive about that.

Q. Do you know where that scorching took place?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?

A. It was a little wide of the center.

Q. I don't mean in the crown-sheet, but at what point was it, in Princeton yard, or do you not know?

A. No, sir; I couldn't tell you where it taken place, whether it was there or not; but that is where we located it.

Q. How did you locate it?

A. The night boilermaker. He reported it to me the next morning.

Q. How did it show—what indication was there of the fact that it was scorched there?

A. It just showed that the bolts was leaking a little and the sheet showed a little scaly, whenever you heat it it begins to break that soot scale loose that forms on the sheet on the inside, and

[297] that was broken loose and the bolts was leaking, and there was a little discoloring of the iron.

Q. You were asked whether the sediment that is in the water and the deposits on the inside of the crown-sheet, whether that will

stop leaks in the stay-bolts. If it has been burned and the holes opened, will that sediment fill up the holes in the stay-bolts, I mean the openings in the stay-bolt holes through which the leak comes, and stop it?

A. No, sir; that wouldn't stop the leak, the sediment wouldn't.

(Witness stands aside.)

Court adjourns until tomorrow morning, October 8, 1914, 9:30 a. m.

[312] (Manuscript page 313 marked out.)

[314] JOHN SCHAEFER.

John Schaefer, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. What is your occupation?

A. At the present time?

Q. Yes.

A. I am a machinist in the erecting shop.

Q. Of what company?

A. The Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. How long have you been employed by the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. Fourteen years.

Q. During that time what occupation have you followed?

A. I followed the machinist's line and I followed boiler inspection and tests.

Q. Did you make any test of this engine 469 that was built for the Virginian Railway?

A. I made a test on our shop number 12461/4 E 28.

Q. Does your record show the Virginian Railway number of that engine?

A. No, it does not; not in the record here, it just shows the shop number.

Q. On what date did you make that test?

A. 4-17, 1912.

Q. That is April the 17th, 1912?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the jury what test you made of that engine.

[315] Q. Did you state when you made the test?

April 17, 1912.

Q. Tell the jury what test you made of that engine?

A. We put 267 pounds to the square inch, water pressure, on this boiler, after all the flues were put in and were thoroughly cleaned on the inside and the mud ring was scraped out.

Q. How long did you let that 267 pounds to the square inch remain on the boiler?

A. About four hours.

Q. What was the result of that test, how did the engine show up?

A. I have it here in the book, shall I read it?

Q. I want to know how the test showed up, whether it showed a good boiler, or a poor boiler?

A. It showed a good boiler.

Q. Tell the jury exactly what the record of that test is?

[316] A. Tightened all wash-out plugs before fire, tightened auxilliary dome before fire; replaced two caps right side of crown before fire; replaced one bushing on crown; watched two crown bar bolts; tightened stud before fire; tightened sand box before fire.

Q. You say that indicates that was a good boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. After this test was over, what did you do with the engine?

A. I left the report for my night man and he made replacements before fire, and put the fire test on.

Q. Who was your night man?

A. James Reed.

Q. Then after the fire test had been made did you make any further test of this engine or run the engine?

A. I kept the record of all the engines and after the fire test was made and the replacements were made and the engine was gotten ready to blow her cylinders out, we run pressure, filled it up to the regular test and watched the boiler on the replacements we had already made, and if it shows anything then we put them on, or we make the replacements again, and then the engine goes on the yard for the running test.

Q. How did it show up under this test that you have just mentioned?

A. We made no record of the running test or on the blow-out test.

Q. It showed no defects then?

[317] A. No, sir.

Q. Did you make the running test you have spoken of?

A. No, sir. What I mean by running test, I stayed out in the yard while the engine is running, and see if anything breaks out on the boiler and see that the safety valves go off at the proper time.

Q. Did you see that done?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did the engine show up under that test?

A. Fine.

Q. You said that two of the stay-bolts showed leaks? What was done with those stay-bolts?

A. Two stay-bolts showed a leak? They were not stay-bolts, they were crown-bolts.

Q. Crown-bolts, I mean.

A. We fixed them up to hold fire and took them out after the fire.

Q. How did she show up then?

A. After we put that second fire on, on the blow-out, they did not show up at all, that showed up fine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt.

Q. Your name is Mr. Schaefer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your Company never sent out for delivery a bad engine since you have been with it, has it?

A. No, sir.

[318] Q. It never did?

A. No, sir.

Q. While hundreds have gone down, haven't they?

A. That doesn't say that the Baldwin people sent them out bad though.

(Witness stands aside.)

[319] JAMES REED.

James Reed, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. What is your occupation?

A. My occupation is air brake inspector now.

Q. For the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been employed by that company?

A. Twelve years.

Q. What has been your employment during that time?

A. First as a machinist, from there to boilermaker, and boiler inspecting.

Q. What was your occupation in April, 1912?

A. Boiler inspector.

Q. Did you inspect engines that we have been talking about?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your shop number 12461/4 E 28?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the jury what inspection you made of that engine?

A. I made a fire inspection of the boiler.

Q. Was the engine complete at that time?

A. The engine was completed, the boiler was completed in the engine.

Q. What test did you make? Describe the test to the jury.

A. A fire test, after the water test is made on the boiler.

[320] Q. That was the test that has just been told about by Mr. Schaefer?

A. Yes, sir; that was in the daytime. I came in at night time to replace the work necessary to be done, or reported to be done, and then we turned around and fired the boiler up. We also opened before that time the dome and we go in and take the throttle out and go out and inspect the crown-sheet to see that there is nothing on the crown and that everything is O. K. Then we put the throttle in again and close the boiler up and put water to two guages, then we fire the boiler up to the steam test of 220 pounds, then we go all over the boiler and see that there is no defect, and see about the few replacements that have been put on her.

Q. Did you do that with this engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how did it show up under that test?

A. First-class.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You say you boiled it out in soda?

A. We blow the cylinders out, blow the dirt out of the cylinders.

Q. You blow the dirt out of the cylinders?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Didn't you boil your crown-sheet with soda?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is after the engine is constructed, isn't it?

[321] A. No, sir; whenever we put that throttle in and fill that boiler with water for the fire test, we put soda in then, and the soda is in then, and after that we leave the water all out and also test it again and wash the boiler out thoroughly, the mud rings and all.

Q. That is after the boiler has been completed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is when your stay-bolts are all in?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The stay-bolts are in about four inches apart all over the entire crown-sheet, are they not?

A. Yes, sir; four inches apart.

Q. That crown-sheet is how long?

A. There are different sizes.

Q. The crown-sheet of this engine, I mean.

A. I couldn't just say how long the crown-sheet is.

Q. How wide was it?

A. I couldn't say just how wide it was.

Q. There is a thing that you call a wagon top over the crown-sheet?

A. Some boilers have that.

Q. Did this one have it or not?

A. A wagon top style, there is two or three different styles for the wagon.

[322] Q. I don't care about the styles, whether it was a buck-board or what it was. Did you have what you call or what boilermakers call a wagon top over the crown-sheet?

A. I don't know whether I could say that or not.

Q. How would you hold the steam in there if you did not have that wagon top over it?

A. We had the shell of the boiler over it.

Q. You had the thing over the crown-sheet that these stay-bolts were fixed in?

A. Yes, sir; that is the shell of the boiler.

Q. Is that what some of them call the wagon top?

A. I don't know whether they call it a wagon top or not.

Q. But you had that shell on that, you speak of?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you went into it, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it possible for any living man to go in that boiler between the crown-sheet and the shell after your stay-bolts are put in, without pulling down the sides of the boiler?

A. You don't go on top of the crown, we go in the boiler, but not on top of the crown; you take a light and look on top of the crown.

Q. Do you mean that you go under the sheet?

A. No, sir; you go inside the boiler.

Q. How do you get in it?

[323] A. By the dome.

Q. It is not possible for any man to get in there, is it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Go in through the four-inch stay-bolts?

A. No, sir; he don't have to go through those four inches.

Q. The stays are put in there over four inches apart?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. A man has got to goin between those or take them out of the way if he goes inside of that boiler, hasn't he?

A. No, sir.

Q. What is he, a snake, can he crawl around in there?

A. You go in the boiler, you do not go on top of the crown-sheet, you go in the boiler, you stay outside the crown-sheet and you have a light and look all over it.

Q. You mean you send a light in instead of going in?

A. You can see all over the crown with your light.

Q. It is not possible for a man to go in there, is it?

A. In the boiler?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When those stay-bolts are sticking up that way?

A. You don't go in the stay-bolts, you go in the boiler.

Q. Do you go over the crown?

A. You do not go over the crown, you can stand outside

[324] with a light and look over the crown.

Q. Physically, he cannot go in there?

A. He can go in the boiler.

Q. I said over the crown?

A. Not over the crown?

Q. If he goes in the boiler he goes in the dome, doesn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that does not let him down below what you call the

shell, does it?

A. That is not on top of the crown; the dome is on the boiler, you go in the boiler and go back to the crown.

Q. The boiler is the whole thing and that includes the flue sheet, the flues, crown-sheet or shell, and the whole thing, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the space wherein the steam is held is completely inclosed with solid steel, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is bound to be or else you couldn't move a wheel of the engine, the steam would go off in the air, wouldn't it, that is true, isn't it?

A. The steam would go up in the air? No, sir.

Q. If you didn't have anything there to encase it and enclose it, why wouldn't it?

A. The shell—there has got to be an open space for the steam.

Q. The shell does encase it?

[325] A. Yes, sir.

Q. You understand my question; it is not a hard question. If you do not have an encasement or an enclosure which you call a shell, and it has been spoken of here as a wagon top, on the top of it and a crown-sheet under the bottom, that is the enclosure wherein the steam is generated and confined, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If that was not solidly enclosed with a heavy steel casing or a wrought iron casing, the steam would escape and go in the air, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, then, is it possible for a man to go inside of the boiler between the crown-sheet and your shell?

A. Not between the crown-sheet and shell.

Q. He couldn't any more do that than he could fly, could he?

A. No, sir.

Q. The only part of the boiler that he could get in would be behind that, wouldn't it?

A. No, in front of it.

Q. Over the fire box?

A. No, sir.

Q. In front of it, where then?

A. You go down into the dome at the barrel of the boiler.

Q. What is the dome? Tell me.

[326] A. The dome sets on the top of the barrel of the boiler, where the throttle sets in.

Q. What is a dome?

A. A dome—that looks something like it on top of an engine (indicating the drum heretofore spoken of).

Q. I am glad you have told me what that thing is, I have been trying to figure out what it is, is that a dome?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know what it is? You don't know whether it is a dome?

A. I don't know what that is.

Q. I thought maybe you could throw some light on it; nobody else has. Now, what is a dome?

A. It is an extension of the boiler, it is the dome of the boiler that the throttle sets in.

Q. Is it on top, on the side or rear or where?

A. On top of the barrel.

Q. Where is the barrel?

A. The barrel is on top of the fire box.

Q. Is the barrel the place where the flues run back through?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then your dome lets you down in on the flues?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But it don't let you in between the crown-sheet and the wagon top?

A. No, sir.

Q. How far is the dome situated behind the fire box?

[327] A. It sets in front of the fire box.

Q. When you speak of the front of the engine you mean the engine next to the pilot?

A. No, sir; nearest to the front of the engine, nearest to the smoke stack.

Q. Is it next to the engineer or next to the pilot, the cow-catcher?

A. It is next to the pilot.

Q. Or cow-catcher?

A. Yes, sir; that is the front of the engine.

Q. Then that dome is in front of the fire box and in front of this crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And over the flues that run back in through the flue sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, when you are back in the dome of your engine with your shell complete, with your flue sheet complete, can you see into the crown-sheet or where the crown-sheet is?

A. Between the crown-sheet and the shell, you can.

Q. How?

A. You are over the top of the flue sheet, you don't go in between this, you go over the top there, and then you are in between the shell and the flues.

Q. You don't get down where the flues are?

[328] A. No, sir; you go on top of the flues.

Q. How big a space is that there?

A. It is big enough for a man to pull himself through any way.

Q. Big enough for a man to pull himself through?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the place where the steam goes to the machinery of the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the space through which the steam goes to the machinery of the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, when you are up over the flues, under the dome, how far are you from the rear of the engine where the fireman and engineer stays?

A. You are right in front of the crown-sheet.

Q. Please give it to me in feet, how far you would be between the rear of the engine and I mean by the rear, now adopting your terms, as the place where the engineer stays in the driving of his engine how far are you from the rear of that boiler?

A. Just as long as the crown-sheet is, you are up at one end of the crown-sheet.

Q. Do you know how long the crown-sheet was in these engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. Haven't you got any idea?

[329] A. No, sir.

Q. Wasn't it several feet?

A. It was several feet; yes, sir.

Q. Then between you and the rear part of that boiler wherein is located these radial stays running up every four inches apart and just as thick as radial stays are in the head of this thing, aren't they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same distance all the way through that boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you get in there to clean it out?

A. We put soda in there and that takes the dirt and everything off and washes it down to the bottom of the boiler, and then we take the hose to make sure that it is all washed and put it in there and open the wash-out plugs and wash all that crown off and everything down to the mud rings. Then we take hooks and clean the mud rings out, if there is any scale or oil or anything like that, and put a hose under the bottom and see that that is thoroughly washed.

Q. You do find these scrapings and filings in there?

A. Once in a while we run across a little bit of it that goes in amongst the grease.

Q. It is pretty hard to get that out, is it not?

A. No, sir; that soda will boil all that out and wash it out to the bottom.

Q. It won't wash the iron?

A. We take our light and look and see if there is any-
[330] thing on there as big as that (indicating).

Q. You do not expect to get that from the soda process?

A. If we see it we get it out.

Q. And if you don't see it you don't get it out?

A. That is what we are there for.

Q. Do you mean to say that your company has not sent out engines in that shape?

A. Not of my inspection.

Q. How about 473?

A. I know nothing about that.

Q. That is one that didn't come under your inspection?

A. I know nothing about that. I only speak of the engines I passed.

Q. I wish I knew your shop number for 473; you haven't got any idea what that is, have you?

A. No, sir; these ten engines is what I was on.

Q. How many batches of engines did you inspect for the Virginian?

A. In different years I inspected quite a number.

Q. Different batches for the Virginian?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Haven't you inspected all of the engines that the Virginian Railway Company got from the Baldwin Locomotive Works?

A. I cannot say all; I inspected some of them.

(Witness stands aside.)

[332] A. M. McGHEE.

A. H. McGhee, sworn, for defendant.

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What line of work do you follow?

A. Boilermaker for the Virginian?

Q. How long have you been a boilermaker?

A. Twelve years now.

Q. How long have you worked for the Virginian?

A. Four years the 28th of last August.

Q. Were you working for the Virginian at Princeton on November the 11th, 1912?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make a Government monthly inspection of engine 469 on November the 11th, 1912?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that one of the original copies of your report to the Government of that inspection?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury whether you inspected this crown-sheet or not.

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. What part of the engine did you inspect?

A. I witnessed the guage test and the pop, setting of the pop and tried both injectors, and the water cocks and the guage cock.

Q. Were they all right?

A. Yes, sir; in good condition.

Q. Please state what condition the two injectors were in [333] on that engine on November the 11th, 1912?

A. They were in good condition, they worked nicely, both of them.

Q. Did you try both of them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have had experience in inspecting and testing injectors, have you?

A. Yes, sir; I have been working on that for twelve years, you may say; I made that my business. I was inspector for the Virginian

people at the time and I went over all that stuff; I had instructions to go over it and I went over it.

Q. What condition did you find the water glass in?

A. It was open and clear.

Q. Did you inspect the guage cocks?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are they for, what is the use of them on the engine?

A. To tell where your water is at and how much you have got in it.

Q. You mean how much water you have got in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What condition were they in?

A. They were open and in good condition.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. This report is signed, A. H. McGhee, Inspector, and went to the Government of the United States?

A. Yes, sir.

[334] Q. Did you ever send one of these reports to the Government that did not show the engine was in good condition, in your life?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did it show that the engine was in bad condition?

A. No, sir.

Q. I asked you did you ever send in one that did not show a good condition?

A. If there was anything bad about it I would have it fixed.

Q. Before you let your report go into the Government?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will change the form of the question. Did you make a report on engine 473 just before its crown-sheet had trouble?

Defendant objected. Overruled. Exception.

A. When 473 came in there, the night man, he got the engine and then it went to the back shop and I inspected it there, but I do not know the date.

[335] Q. You still haven't answered my question. I asked you if you made a report of engine 473 just before, not after this trouble, but before it had trouble with its crown-sheet, the same kind of a report that you sent in one 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You reported that in good fix, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When as a matter of fact there was stuff on the crown-sheet, wasn't there?

A. Let me understand you.

Q. After you made this report on engine 473, after you made the report it developed that there was stuff, filings and scrapings, etc., on the crown-sheet of engine 473, wasn't there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. While its crown-sheet was in that condition, your report was in with the Government showing everything O. K., wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; I think it was. I inspected it.

Q. Did you have Mr. Massie's report when you inspected engine 469, the offending engine in this case, on November the 11th, 1912, and by Mr. Massie, I mean the engineer who had run it on the trip just before that?

A. No, sir.

[336] Q. I will ask you, did you ever see the work report turned in by Engineer Massie with reference to this particular engine, 469, turned in on the 10th day of November, 1912, the day or day before you made this inspection?

A. No, sir.

Q. You did not see that?

A. No, sir.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Do you know whether you had inspected engine 473 before those leaks developed around the crown bolts?

A. Yes, sir; I think I had been over it, I am sure I had.

Q. Do you know when that engine arrived?

A. No, sir; I haven't the date, I did have it.

[337] Q. Do you inspect those engines at any time except when you make the monthly Government inspection?

A. Yes, sir; when I was inspector there in the day time, I would make a careful examination. I went in and looked at it. I wouldn't go over all of the holes and stuff like that, but I would see that everything was in good shape.

Q. Do you know whether you had made a Government report

on engine 473, or a Government inspection and Government report on engine 473 before these leaks developed?

A. I couldn't say positively; no, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

He did say he had.

By Mr. Hall:

I do not think he understood the question and that is why I asked him over again.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You said a few minutes ago you did make it?

A. I did not say positively, I said I thought I had, but I do not know positively that I had.

Q. You did not say before anything about thinking about it?

A. No, sir; I said I think I had, but I did not say positively.

By Mr. Staples:

Please go back there and read his evidence.

(The evidence referred to is here read by the stenographer.)

(Witness stands aside.)

[338] A. S. FUNK.

A. S. Funk, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What is your work?

A. Boilermaker.

Q. How long have you been a boilermaker?

A. Eight years.

Q. Were you employed by the Virginian?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been employed by the Virginian?

A. I have been employed by the Virginian four different times, the last time I have been employed about four months, or a little over three months, close to four.

Q. Are you the A. S. Funk who made this Government report of the inspection of 469 on November the 11th, 1912?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What part of the engine did you inspect?

A. The stay-bolts of the crown-sheet, and I seen the water glass and guage cocks were cleaned out; looked through the arch pipe and saw the plug.

Q. Tell us what condition you found the stay-bolts and crown-sheet in?

A. First-class condition.

Q. What inspection did you make of them?

A. I went over all the stay-bolts with a hammer to see if I could find any broken bolts or to see if anything was wrong with it in any way.

Q. If there had been anything wrong with the stay-bolts [339] would your inspection have shown that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What inspection did you make of the crown-sheet?

A. I went over the bolts and looked at the crown-sheet to see if I could see anything wrong with it.

Q. Was the crown-sheet pocketed or did it show any signs of being burned at that time?

A. No, sir.

Q. If it had been burned or pockets in it as you see that crown-sheet there now, would you have been able to see them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What condition did you find the water glass in?

A. We took the water glass off and cleaned it out, we run a piece of steel wire through it to see if there was any mud in it, and we did the guage cock the same way.

Q. What is that for?

A. If there is anything in there to knock it out.

Q. Did you test them afterwards?

A. No, sir; I left it for Mr. McGhee; I get off at 4:30 in the morning.

Q. And he made a test of those?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not test the injectors?

A. No, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Where did you start being a boilermaker?

[340] A. The first I was a boilermaker, I worked in Cape Charles, Virginia, for the N. Y. P. & N. Railroad.

Q. How long did you work there?

A. Eight months.

Q. What was your position there?

A. Boilermaker; that is the first time that I got boilermaker's pay, that is where I first worked at.

Q. Did you ever go through an apprenticeship?

A. I served some apprenticeship and helped.

Q. Where at?

A. The Roanoke Machine Shops and in Cleveland, Ohio.

Q. How much did you serve?

A. Not much, but I started helping again and got a job as a boilermaker.

Q. Isn't it true that pretty nearly all of the boilermaking that you have been at was done helping or just a helper?

A. No, sir; I have been a boilermaker for eight years.

Q. You got to be a boilermaker but you never did get your trade?

A. Yes, sir; I can do boiler work.

Q. But you never made your apprenticeship?

A. I never served all my time.

Q. How much time did you serve?

A. I helped a good while, I did lots of that, but I never served all my time. I do not pretend to be as good as some of them, but I can do that work. I do not claim to be an expert, I claim to

[341] be an ordinary boilermaker and can do ordinary boiler work.

Q. You are not a a machinist either, are you?

A. No, sir.

Q. And yet you are doing the very most delicate work of the kind that is required around a boiler, that is inspecting stay-bolts?

A. No, sir; that is a boilermaker's work and not a machinist's work.

Q. You inspect them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you inspect them?

A. I take a hammer and hit every one and you can tell by the sounds and by the vibration of the sheet and the way the hammer bounces, etc.

Q. It requires a lot of experience to do that, does it not?

A. I have done a lot of it.

Q. Where did you start doing that?

A. I inspected some for the Norfolk & Western and some for the Seaboard Air Line.

Q. When did you inspect for the Norfolk & Western?

A. I don't know exactly the date, but whenever the night inspector would be off I would take his job, I didn't have a regular inspector's job.

Q. Not for the Norfolk & Western?

A. I would assist, and when the assistant was off, I inspected them.

Q. Did you ever sign an inspector's report for the Nor-
[342] folk & Western?

A. I believe when I inspected them it was before that Government report came out.

Q. You never did sign any report that you know of, of an inspection of a boiler for the Norfolk & Western?

A. I never signed any Government inspection report, but I signed the boiler inspection.

Q. When did you sign a report for the Norfolk & Western now?

A. I cannot give you the date?

Q. What year was it?

A. I worked for the Norfolk & Western about four times in Bluefield, but I cannot say the exact date.

Q. Did you work at Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where did you work last?

A. I worked at the West End, Roanoke, as a boilermaker, and in East End as a helper.

Q. When did you work in Roanoke last?

A. West Roanoke.

Q. What was your employment there?

A. Boilermaker.

Q. What pay did you get?

A. I think they were paying 34½ cents an hour.

Q. Who were you under?

A. Mr. Laughorn was the boss and Mr. Doarnberger was
[343] the master boilermaker.

Q. Mr. Doarnberger is stationed at East Roanoke?

A. He is foreman of the shop at the East End.

Q. And you were at the West End?

A. Yes, sir; Mr. Laughorn was at the West End.

Q. You never did any boiler work under Mr. Doarnberger, did you?

A. No, sir; only helped.

Q. What kind of an inspection did you make of that engine, 469?

A. I went over the stay-bolts, crown-bolts, and seen that the water glass was cleaned out, the machinist did that, and I stood there and looked to see that he done it, because I had to swear to it. That is a machinist's work to do that and not my work.

Q. You swear you did it although the machinist actually did it?

A. The machinist did it and I watched it because I had to swear to it, that is machinist's work and not my work.

Q. Did you go inside the engine?

A. I went in the fire box, I did not take the dome cap off.

Q. Did you go in the boiler?

A. Not where the flues are; I went in the fire box.

Q. You did not look inside the boiler?

A. I did not take the dome cap off.

[344] Q. Have you ever done that to that engine?

A. No, sir; I never have.

Q. Who did do it to that engine?

A. I can't say.

Q. Did you inspect engine No. 473?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never did inspect that engine?

A. No, sir; I worked on the engine but I never inspected it.

Q. Who did inspect it?

A. I don't know.

Q. There didn't anybody inspect that engine at all, did they?

Defendant objected. Question withdrawn.

A. I don't know about that.

By Mr. Staples:

We withdrew the question and answer.

By the Court:

The question and answer are withdrawn, gentlemen of the jury.

Q. You don't know who did inspect it?

A. I don't know who went over the stay-bolts and gave it an inspection like I gave 469, I don't know who did it.

Q. You never inspected engine 473 before it had that boiler trouble?

A. Not as I know of, if I did I don't know it.

Q. What did you find in there when you worked in there?

A. I found the crown bolts leaking; I did not work on it; I went in and seen it was leaking and reported it.

Q. What was the matter?

[345] A. The crown bolts were leaking.

Q. What caused it?

A. The scale or something; I just heard it; I don't know anything about it.

Q. What was it, scale or anything?

A. I don't know; I never seen it; I couldn't tell you.

Q. You say you examined up there for pocketing?

A. I never said that engine.

Q. 469, I mean.

A. I examined it for everything.

Q. You did not inspect it after November the 12th?

A. I inspected it November the 11th.

Q. You did not inspect it after the hostler had it all day on November the 11th?

A. I looked at it when it came to Bluefield, I mean Princeton.

Q. Who brought it in?

A. I cannot say; but after the explosion I looked in there, but that was after the explosion.

Q. You never made any examination to see whether the hostler burned it on the yard?

A. I wasn't down there, I was in Princeton.

(Witness stands aside.)

[346] W. J. PHARR.

W. J. Pharr, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Where were you employed on November the 14th, 1912?

A. Roanoke, for the Virginian.

Q. What were you doing there at that time, what was the general line of your work?

A. Working there as a machinist.

Q. As a machinist?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When Mr. A. W. Andrews brought in engine 469 on the morning of the 14th of November, 1912, did he make a work report of that engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you take charge of that report and do the work that it called for?

A. Yes, sir; Mr. Kelly and myself did.

Q. Was Mr. Andrew's signature to that report?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know his signature?

A. I think I do.

Q. What became of that original work report?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you not file it as a part of your evidence in the trial of the case in court at Roanoke?

[347] A. I suppose the foreman must have done that, we signed it and put it back in the box, and the foreman signed it, and we signed it after the work was done.

Q. You did not understand my question, you were on the witness stand when this case was tried in Roanoke, were you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't it a fact that the original with Mr. Andrews' signature to it was shown to you there and you identified his signature and filed the report as part of your evidence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would look at this copy of the report and state whether that is a copy of the report that you filed with your evidence in Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir; that is it.

Q. You say that is a copy?

A. Yes, sir.

[348] The Virginian Railway Company.

Form 629.

Report of condition of Engine No. 469 after careful inspection on arrival at Roanoke, 9:40 a. m., 11-14-1912.

Engine in good condition with the following exceptions:

Tighten L Wrist Pin, stop leaks to steam Ram R side.
Train Pipe Pressure.....
Main Drum Pressure..... Does this engine throw fire..No...
Safety Valve Lifts at..O. K...
Safety Valve Seats at.....

ANDREWS, Engineman.

Note: Enginemen must carefully inspect their engines after each trip, and report their condition on this form whether needing repairs or not. They will be held responsible for defect not reported. No attention will be given to verbal reports or reports not signed by Enginemen.

(Reverse Side.)

Repaired at Roke on 11-14, 1912.

The following repairs were made to this engine:

No. 469. Inspected and Repaired, R. Steam Ram Tightened, L. Wrist Pin Nut. Opened Sand.

PHARR & KELLEY.

Inspected ash pan and front end.

KIMMERLING.

Repairs Made By .....
(Name of Workingman in Charge.)
Approved By C. B. D. .....
(Foreman, Roundhouse.)

Note: Workman in charge of the work will sign for the repairs done. Foreman of Roundhouse will approve and forward to the Master Mechanic..

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. Did you and Mr. Kelly make these repairs which are shown on this report and that you show on the back were made?

A. We certainly did.

[349] Q. One thing, it says on here, "Tightened L. Wrist Pin," I suppose that means the left wrist pin. What is a wrist pin and what did you do to it?

A. We tightened the nut on it. It holds the front end of the main rod into the cross-head and sometimes the nut works loose against the key. There is a key that goes through the end of the

wrist pin and they sometimes get loose and we tighten them up.

Q. That had nothing to do with the crown-sheet or injectors?

A. Not a thing.

Q. Or the water glass or the water cocks?

A. Nothing at all.

Q. The next thing reported there is "Stop leak to Steam Ram R side." What was that?

A. That is the steam valve that admits the steam to the injector and when you put your injector on you open that valve and it leaks but it does not hurt the injector, it only obstructs the view of the engineer and we stopped all of that and all other steam leaks.

Q. It prevents his view along the track in front of him?

[350] A. Yes, sir; but it does not have anything to do with the injector at all. What little steam would leak there wouldn't affect the injector at all.

Q. What did you do to that?

A. We put some asbestos packing in it and screwed the nut up on it.

No cross-examination.

(Witness stands aside.)

[351] W. R. MOORE.

W. R. Moore, sworn for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. In November, 1912, what work were you doing for the Virginian Railway?

A. Roundhouse clerk.

Q. Where?

A. Princeton.

Q. Were you acquainted with Mr. Andrews' signature?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I show you a report of engine 469 and I wish you would please look at that and state to the jury whether or not it is in his handwriting and signed by him?

A. Yes, sir; it is all his handwriting.

By the Court:

What date is that?

By Mr. Hall:

The 13th of November.

By Mr. Hall:

I desire now to offer this in evidence and to read it.

"Report of Engine 469, 11-13-12.

Tighten Knuckle Pin, R (Right) Front, Renew Side Rod Bushing to Driver No. 2 Right Side, set up Wedges, overhaul lubricators to Air Reverser."

No cross-examination.

(Witness stands aside.)

[352] J. A. WHITESELL.

J. A. Whitesell, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Where were you employed and in what capacity on November the 14th, 1911?

A. Roanoke, Virginia.

Q. Did Mr. Andrews bring in engine No. 469 to the Roanoke roundhouse on the morning of November 14th, 1911?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you take charge of that engine when he brought it in?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any test of the injectors?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you find them?

A. All O. K.

Q. Did you examine the guage cocks?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How was that?

A. Opened.

Q. Did you examine the water glass?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you find that?

A. Open.

Q. What did you do with that engine?

A. I coaled it and sand it and put it on the pit and the fire knocker cleaned the fire and when it came off the pit I put it in the roundhouse.

Q. Was it in the roundhouse all day?

[353] A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any inspection or examination of the crown-sheet when that engine was brought in?

A. Yes, sir; I did.

Q. What condition was it in?

A. O. K. as far as I could see.

Q. Were there any pockets or places in it, sagging down as that crown-sheet over there shows now?

A. No, sir; not as I could see; I didn't see anything like that.

Q. Did the engine have water in it all day?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do with it?

A. I coaled it and sand it.

Q. I mean at the end of your day's work who took charge of it?

A. Mr. Henry Neece.

Q. Did he come on duty when you went off?

A. Yes, sir; he was at the passenger station with an engine when I went off.

Q. Was the crown-sheet of the engine all right when you turned it over to Mr. Neece?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there water in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. How many engines did you handle that day?

A. Indeed I don't know; I expect about seven or eight.

Q. Did you handle all of them at the same time?

A. No, sir; but all the same day.

Q. They were all there all day or most of them?

A. Most all day; of course some of them went out.

[354] Q. And part of the day you were handling all of these engines at one time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And all of them had fire in them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you had to try to keep watch on seven or eight engines?

A. No, sir; I didn't do anything like that; I didn't attend to the fire and water.

Q. Didn't you keep watch over them?

A. I filled the cups. I went over that, and they had a regular fire and water man.

Q. Who was the fire and water man?

A. Monk Vaughan; he works for the Norfolk & Western.

Q. He works now for the Norfolk & Western?

A. I think so; if he has not quit.

Q. How did he happen to quit the Virginian?

A. He just wanted more money, I suppose.

Q. You don't know, then, why he quit?

A. No, sir.

Q. He has quit?

[355] A. He didn't get fired.

Q. How do you know he didn't?

A. I know he didn't.

Q. I never said anything about his getting fired, did I?

A. No; you said he kept the fire.

Q. Yes, sir; I said that. And you say he attended to that engine as far as the fire and water was concerned?

A. Yes, sir; I did.

Q. You said you coaled it and sand it and put it on the pit?

A. For the fire knocker to cool it.

Q. You mean to knock the fire out of the fire box?

A. To clean the fire, and he left fire in the fire box; he knocks the clinkers out and the dirt and ashes, and left fire in there; I built the fire up afterward.

Q. And you put some more coal in there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q And shoved it in the roundhouse and let it set there?

A. I put the engine in the roundhouse and turned it over to the fire and water man.

Q. Whether or not that engine got burned in there, you don't know?

A. No, sir; it didn't get burned in there.

Q. How do you know?

A. I know.

Q. Tell the jury how you know it didn't get burned.

[356] A. Because it was kept full of water all day long.

Q. How do you know it was?

A. I was at the engine different times; it is the hostler's place not to sit down when the engine is in there; it is his duty to go over those engines and see if they are all right.

Q. I know that is his duty, but the question is, whether he does it?

A. I did it.

Q. You think you did it?

A. I don't think anything about it, I know.

Q. Didn't you just now say that Mr. Monk Vaughan attended to that end of it?

A. I said he attended to fire and water.

Q. You didn't have anything to do with the fire and water, and you did not watch that at all?

A. I didn't watch that at all.

Q. How do you know that there did not get low water in that engine?

A. I went over there several times that day and looked after that to see that water was in them.

Q. You say you did not watch them, isn't that watching them?

A. It is the hostler's place to look over those engines every now and then to see if they are all right.

Q. Aren't you the man who testified in the Federal Court before?

A. No, sir.

Q. You did not testify before?

A. No, sir.

Q. Didn't you say down there before that there had been [357] a whole lot of complaints of engines there?

A. No, sir; I did not say that.

A. I wasn't on the witness stand.

Q. Are you positive you did not testify down there?

A. No, sir; I wasn't on the witness stand and I did not testify down there.

Q. Who was the hostler who testified down in Roanoke?

A. I don't know; you can't prove that by me.

Q. If you attended these engines, why didn't they have you there before?

A. They didn't call me on the witness stand.

Q. You say you were trying to watch seven or eight engines there at once, weren't you?

A. No, sir; I wasn't trying to do that.

Q. What else were you doing besides that?

A. I told you I put sand on the engines, every engine that came in, and coal.

Q. And you put sand on the engine and what else did you do?

A. I put sand and coal.

Q. And you drew the cinders and clinkers out of them?

A. No, sir; I didn't have a thing to do with that.

[358] Q. You saw that was done?

A. That was done and I drove the engine over the pit for the fire knocker.

Q. You were in the engine when it was being done?

A. No, sir; I was outside.

Q. You watched it being done?

A. Yes, sir; I took it off the pit.

Q. You watched it from the outside?

A. I took the engine off the pit, put coal on it, kept the fire in it, and ran it in the roundhouse and the water man got on it.

Q. This engine came in early in the morning about 8 or 9 o'clock?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And she set there all day?

A. Yes, sir; until the time she was called.

Q. With fire under the crown-sheet?

A. And water in the boiler.

Q. Were you supposed to be the man to see that water was in the boiler?

A. Yes—no; I am supposed to look over them every now and then, go over them in the roundhouse.

Q. And you just went there every now and then?

A. Yes, sir; the fire and water man, he took charge of them.

Q. And you were around working with other engines, seven other engines that occupied your attention?

A. I was working with other engines.

[359] Q. You cannot tell to save your life whether or not low water might not have gotten on that engine that day while you were working on these other engines?

A. It was full of water every time I looked at it.

Q. You don't know whether it got low water while you weren't looking at it, do you?

A. I wouldn't positively say about that.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What else were you going to say there, when Mr. Staples

interrupted you; you say you couldn't say whether low water was in there or not, did you say that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you start to say anything else?

A. It seemed to me like I started to say something else.

Q. This fire and water man, was it his duty to keep the fire up and put the water in?

A. Yes, sir; after it went in the roundhouse.

Q. You had nothing to do with the actual building of the fire and putting in the water?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you look at the engines from time to time to see that they had water and fire in them properly?

A. I did.

Q. How long does a boiler of water last when the engine [360] is in the roundhouse and not working?

A. You mean a full boiler full?

Q. Yes.

A. It will last about an hour and a half or maybe an hour.

Q. When the engine is standing still in the roundhouse?

A. A boiler full of water will last an hour. I don't mean it will go clean out in an hour, I mean it will come down in the glass about an inch from the top.

Q. How often do you have to renew the water in them when the engine is simply standing in the roundhouse?

A. Five or six times a day.

Q. What kind of a fire is in the engine then?

A. We don't carry a very heavy fire.

Q. What is the object of keeping the fire in the engine?

A. To have them hot and have steam ready to run when they are called.

Q. You don't have to keep up the steam pressure that is used in running, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. What steam pressure do you ordinarily keep up on the engine in the roundhouse?

A. From 120 to 140, or something like that.

Q. How high do you keep the water in your glass when the engine is in the roundhouse?

A. We aim to keep it above the top of the glass.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You remember what you did all of that day, don't you?

A. Certainly I remember what I did all day.

Q. You remember whether you got sick that day or not?

A. No, sir; I didn't get sick.

Q. What were you doing about ten o'clock that morning?

œ361] A. I was filling the rod cups and grease cups.

Q. What were you doing about 11 o'clock that day?

A. I couldn't tell you that; I might have been eating my dinner for all I know, we generally take time to eat our dinner between engines.

Q. Then you cannot tell what you were doing all day?

A. I cannot tell exactly, but I was working all day.

Q. Do you remember that day any more particularly than any other day?

A. Certainly not; a man has got to have his mind on what he is doing every day.

Q. Your statements are made from the fact that you do not think any engine was ever burned in the yard there?

A. I do not think there was ever an engine burned there; I never heard no complaint of it at all.

Q. You do not remember anything that you did on this day any more particularly than you did the day before?

A. We do the same thing every day.

Q. You don't remember this day any more than what

[362] occurred the day before; no man can do that; you couldn't carry any individual day in your mind, could you?

A. No, sir; no more than you could any other day, I do not suppose.

RE-RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You heard that night of the accident, or the next day, in which Mr. Andrews was killed?

A. Yes, sir; the next day; I heard it the next morning.

Q. Please state whether or not when you heard the next morning of the going down of this crown-sheet if that impressed on your mind what occurred with reference to this engine the day before?

A. Yes, sir, it impressed it on my mind.

(Witness stands aside.)

[363] H. T. NEECE.

H. T Neece, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Where do you live?

A. Roanoke.

Q. Where did you live in November, 1912?

A. Roanoke.

Q. What were you doing in November, 1912?

A. Hostler.

Q. Do you remember the day and time when engine 469 had the crown-sheet blown down when Mr. Andrews was killed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have charge of that engine any time during the day of November the 14th?

A. Not through the day, only that night after 7 o'clock.

Q. Did you take charge of it at 7 o'clock?

A. Not at 7 o'clock, it was 8 o'clock.

Q. What did you do with the engine?

A. I brought the engine out of the house and taken here around the south side of the coal wharf and got her ready for a call at 8:30.

Q. Had it been called to go out?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any examination of that engine before you took it out or after you took it out and before you turned it over to Mr. Andrews?

A I made an inspection of her after I got her out of [364] the house.

Q. Did you try the injectors?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Both of them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were they working all right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you try the water glass?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the guage cocks?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What condition were they in?

A. O. K.

Q. Do you always do that before turning an engine over to the engineer who is called to take it out?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any examination of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the jury what examination you made of the crown-sheet and how you did it?

A. The brick arch in these MC engines come pretty far back to your door, over the top of your door, and you only can see part of your crown-sheet, and when you have some kind of a light with you you can put it back to the front side of your crown-sheet and see it, you have got to have an awful light fire if you can see it, and these engines, when we bring them from the house, the exhaust from the engine, it raises the smoke and dust off the brick arch and [365] in the engine, it would scatter in there, and I took a bunch of waste and made me a torch and put it on the fire hook and poured in some kerosene oil on it, and put it in there to get to see the crown-sheet.

Q. If there is a bright fire in the fire box, can you see the crown-sheet without a torch?

A. Not all over it; you see the crown-sheet is pretty far back.

Q. What condition did you find this crown-sheet in when you examined it?

A. O. K.

Q. Did it have any pockets in it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Was it leaking?

A. No, sir; that about the pockets, I cannot say whether it had any pockets in it or not, I couldn't see none.

Q. Have you seen the pockets in this crown-sheet since it has been here or have you looked at it?

A. I haven't looked particular at it, I just glanced at it.

Q. If there had been any leaks, would you have seen them?

A. Yes, sir.

[366] Q. Were you on this engine when Mr. Andrews came and took charge of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you turn it over to him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Jerre Walton there when Mr. Andrews took charge of it?

A. No, sir.

Q. When Mr. Andrews came, what did you do?

A. When Mr. Andrews came and got on the engine, I was hooking the fire and throwing in a little coal. He hollored to me to take his bucket and a little grip that he had; I won't say whether he had a bucket, but it was a little grip, and he told me to take it and set it over there for him, and he came up on the engine and sat down on the left side of the engine, and then I clumb over on the right side, had the injector working on the right side of the engine, and he came up on there, and I stood there and hollored to the boy, I said, "All right, let the coal come," and there was so much dust in it he hollored at him to stop, and I stopped him and he said, "Shut that one up and we will put the left injector on and wet this coal."

Q. And did you put on the left injector and work it while he was there?

A. Yes, sir; Mr. Andrews opened the water valve and I put the steam on it.

Q. Did you leave the engine and turn it over to Mr. [367] Andrews?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that the last you saw of the engine before the explosion?

A. No; sir; it wasn't the last time I seen it.

Q. You had nothing to do with it after that?

A. No, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the engine after Mr. Andrews took charge of it?

A. No, sir.

Q. What time was that, do you know?

A. It was something about 8:15 or 8:30 when he took charge of the engine. After I set it down at the water tank he took charge of it.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. I believe you told us that you wouldn't like to state whether there were pockets in the crown-sheet or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you did not want—being under your oath, you wouldn't make that statement?

A. Yes, sir; I will make that—I don't know though.

Q. You will make what?

A. What did you ask me?

Q. If you will make the statement whether or not there were pockets in the crown-sheet, buckles in the crown-sheet; you told the jury that you did not know whether there were any or not, [368] didn't you?

A. Yes, sir; I told them that.

Q. You told them the truth when you told them that, didn't you?

A. I think I did.

Q. Mr. Neece, how much water was in the engine?

A. When I found the engine?

Q. No, sir; when you turned it over to Mr. Andrews?

A. It was full of water.

Q. How much water was in the tank?

A. In the tank?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. It was filled up after I filled it.

Q. After you filled the boiler you filled the tank?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the boiler and the tank were both full of water when you turned it over to Mr. Andrews for that trip that night. That is a fact, isn't it?

A. Now, I did not fill the tank, but that helper of mine filled the tank, and I stood on the ground and watched it.

Q. You saw it filled?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you know that the tank and boiler were both filled when it was turned over to Mr. Andrews?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you poured some kerosene oil on a piece of [369] waste and looked back in that engine under that boiler or under that crown-sheet of that engine that night?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then by the aid of that light—was that light enough for you to see that crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And notwithstanding the fact that you could see the crown-sheet, you refuse to state that there was no buckles in it; that is true, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The stenographer cannot get your nods, you will have to talk out so that he can get them on paper. Where did you get the

kerosene oil?

A. Where did I get it?

Q. Yes.

A. Out of the torch.

Q. The torch on the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You took the oil out of the engine torch and put it on a piece of waste?

A. On my own torch.

Q. You couldn't have seen the crown-sheet without that light, could you?

A. I guess you could, if you had a bright fire in the engine.

Q. There wasn't enough fire in the engine when Mr. Andrews took it to enable him to see the crown-sheet without a torch,

[370] was there?

A. Mr. Andrews?

Q. Yes, sir; that is what you told us.

A. I don't know about that; he could have blowed the engine if he wanted to have seen the crown-sheet; he could blow the fire in the engine until he got it light enough to see.

Q. He could have made a bright fire in there?

A. It would have taken three or four or five minutes to have blown that smoke and stuff out of there.

Q. What reason did you have—the smoke and stuff you say was in the fire box?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What reason did you give at the last trial for being so particular about getting a light and using some waste and putting it on the fire hook and examining it?

A. What was the reason?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. There was an engine that had a few stay-bolts that he said was leaking and he claimed that it was done there.

Q. Didn't you testify before that you had been accused of burning engines on the yard by different engineers, and that was the reason why you were particular to get a torch to make an examination?

A. I do not think so.

Q. Do you deny having made that statement at the former trial?

A. I do not think I made it that way.

[371] Q. Do you deny making that statement at the former

trial?

A. I do not think I did.

Q. Didn't you say that the reason for using that torch was that you had been accused of burning engines on the yard and that you used the torch in this particular instance because you had been accused of burning engines; is not that what you said?

A. I said I looked at this engine because they accused people of burning engines at Roanoke.

Q. They had accused the hostler of burning engines at Roanoke, that is what you mean, isn't it, and that is the reason you gave for it?

A. Yes.

Q. When you do find buckling on the crown-sheet, what do you do?

A. I did not hear you.

Q. When you do find buckling in the crown-sheet, if you do find it, what do you do with it?

A. Report it.

Q. When?

A. When do I report it?

Q. Yes.

A. I put it on a little book and then I report it on a big book at the roundhouse.

Q. You keep your books there for that purpose?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you never made a report of any buckling of a [372] crown-sheet, have you?

A. I think I have.

Q. You never did that more than one, did you?

A. I made it on one engine, and I guess that engine is still in the service yet; it don't belong to the Virginian Railroad, though.

Q. It is in service, but doesn't belong to them; it was one they just borrowed?

A. No, sir; they didn't have anything to do with it as I know of; but it was a contractor's engine.

Q. When you find this condition in the engine, what becomes of the engine then; who do you turn it over to?

A. I don't understand you.

Q. Do you turn it over to the engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you testify before that when this engine was turned over to Mr. Andrews that you rode the engine down to Franklin

Road?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did that, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was Mr. Jerre Walton then, if he was the fireman and you turned the engine over to the engineer, and he had gone on his trip where was the fireman? Wasn't he in the engine?

A. This is what I mean, that after I brought the engine out of the roundhouse and set it over on the south side of the coal wharf and taken it around to Franklin Road and brought it back

[373] what they call the straight track to get coal on the engine and put it in the hole to put water in it, and right there the tank is where I turned it over to Mr. Andrews.

Q. Didn't you testify before that after you turned this engine over to Mr. Andrews you rode with him to Franklin Road and got off?

A. No, sir; I do not think I did.

Q. Do you deny stating that?

A. I think I will.

Q. It certainly is true that Mr. Andrews started off from the and he had his fireman with him, didn't he?

A. Yes, sir; but I never seen his fireman, he might have gone on at Franklin Road for all I know.

Q. You didn't have any trouble working these injectors, did you?

A. Not a bit.

Q. Not a bit in the world?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never were an engineer, were you?

A. No, sir; I do not expect to be one.

Q. You never even fired, did you?

A. Yes, sir?

Q. You did fire some?

A. Not to amount to anything though.

Q. How long?

[374] A. About four or five trips.

Q. Can you tell whether an injector is working?

A. I cannot tell you that, for I never had enough experience because I didn't have time to listen.

Q. How did you put on the injector? You said you did, you tested the injector. How did you test the injector and know it is working if you cannot tell when it is working?

COPY BOUND CLO

A. You mean standing still?

Q. Standing still or running or anyway.

A. I will state it while it is standing still, you can hear the injector working all right when she is standing still.

Q. And you never had enough experience on the road to tell whether you can hear one running when the train is running, is that the idea?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You can sure tell, you can stop and listen with your ears and tell that it is running, so far as the duty of a hostler is concerned, can you, or can you not?

A. I don't understand you.

Q. In other words, just being an hostler, you do not have any trouble with your ears and determining whether an injector is throwing water in the boiler, do you?

A. While standing still?

Q. At any time when you have to fool with it.

A. No, sir; you can always tell when you are working it.

[375] Q. How do you tell it?

A. By the sound of the injector.

Q. What kind of a sound?

A. It has a sort of a ringing sound.

Q. Ringing like something solid or does it have a steam puff to it?

A. It sounds like it has steam force to it.

Q. It sounds like it has a steam force behind it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then that ringing sound, that solid sound, is the water that goes through the pipe and makes it ring, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What kind of a sound does it have when it is not working?

A. A blowing sound: it don't have any sound at all, you can hear it blowing.

Q. The appliances for turning the injector valve are all in the cab, aren't they?

A. The injector?

Q. No, sir: the appliances for turning it, that is all situated in the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. While the injector proper is underneath the cab?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were late getting to work that night?

SE IN CENTER

[376] A. I was on time.

Q. Didn't you say you didn't get there until 8 o'clock and that your hour was 7?

A. Yes, sir; that is what I said.

Q. Then you were an hour late?

A. I had other duties to perform before I went to the round-house.

Q. Before you got to this engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you got to this engine the fire was in it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And who attended it for that hour?

A. There wasn't any one.

Q. Was there somebody there when you got to it?

A. My helpers was all there.

Q. Who was there when you got there?

A. I guess there was about fifteen or twenty men there.

Q. Name one of them, please.

A. A fellow by name of Mason.

Q. Name any other witness who is here in attendance upon this trial that was there. Can you do that?

A. No, sir; the day fellows have all gone; what are here are the night fellows.

Q. And Mr. Whitesell was a day fellow, wasn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he had gone and you were an hour late in getting to that engine, and he had left it that hour without anybody to attend to it, didn't he?

A. No, sir.

Q. Who was attending to it?

[377] A. The helper.

Q. Which helper?

A. The fire and water man.

Q. Who is he, Mr. Monk Vaughan?

A. He was in the day time.

Q. Who was the man there, I mean the other man?

A. I won't say who it was.

Q. You just imagine that somebody was there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Without knowing?

(No answer.)

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Was the whole roundhouse force there when you came in there that night or do you know?

A. I don't know whether the whole force was on or not.

Q. Your force was there, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; my force was there.

Q. You were at the head of how many people?

A. Four.

Q. And were all of your men there when you got there?

A. Yes, sir.

[378] Q. You were asked about another engine being made to leak around the stay-bolts, or that you found one that was, and the engineer said that you had burned it on the yard. What engine was that and who was the engineer?

A. I don't remember who was the engineer; it has been about four or five years ago or maybe longer than that.

Q. Where was that engine running?

A. That was running between Victoria and Roanoke.

Q. Did you ever have an engineer to accuse you of burning a crown-sheet at any other time than that time?

A. No, sir.

Q. Was that what you had reference to?

A. Yes, sir; that was done—I forgot who was master mechanic or general superintendent of motive power; he was down there at the station when No. 14 came in and asked for me and I was there and he jumped on me and eat me up about the engine and I told him I never had looked at the engine, I never had looked at none of them, but he eat me up so bad, he said he expected he would have to fire me over it, so that put me a little bit more on to my job.

Q. You looked after that to see whether there were any leaks?

A. Yes, sir.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. I believe you told us at the other trial it was not your regular custom to pour oil on waste to make this examination, but you did it to this engine?

[379] A. I done it on all that had this high brick arch and all that didn't have high brick arches.

Q. Didn't you state it was not your practice to do that

but you did it to this engine?

A. That is what I said.

Q. That is what you said, wasn't it, and do you mean to say this accusation against you for four or five years before had just suddenly popped in your mind and made you perform this examination by a torch light contrary to your usual practice, is that what you want to tell this jury?

A. I don't understand you.

Q. Read the question to him again.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. I been making that practice all the time.

Q. Didn't you state on the former examination in the Federal Court and didn't you state just a few minutes ago that was not your custom, that it was a departure from your custom?

A. I don't know about that.

Q. If you don't know about it, who in the world would?

A. I guess somebody else would.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What kind of engine is it that you use a torch to see the crown-sheet?

A. The M. C. engine.

Q. Why do you use a torch with the engine to do that?

A The brick arch comes up pretty high in them, I be-
[380] lieve they are a little higher than in the M. B. engines.

Q. The other engines that do not have that high brick arch, do you have to use a torch to look at the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. So you only use a torch with these engine with high brick arches?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You don't mean to say you use a torch with all engines that have that high brick arch. Didn't you tell us that you did not? You just told us that you did not use a torch with all engines that had the high brick arch, didn't you?

A. He didn't ask me that way, I don't think.

Q. Isn't it true that you just happened to use a torch occasionally and you said even with the engines with high arches and engines with low arches, and all engines, that in examining them it was rarely the case that you used a torch, isn't that true?

A. I don't know. That is the way I made the statement. I used it on all engines with high brick arches. This is what I mean:

I used it on all engines that had high brick arches.

Q. Do you now mean to tell the jury that every time an engine was turned over to you that you used a torch for an examination on the high brick arches every time it was done?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Didn't you state in your examination before that that
[381] was not your practice, even on that class of engine, and that you did it on this particular time because you had these reasons for it? Wasn't that your testimony?

A. I had reason for doing it on all of them.

Q. You don't answer my question. Didn't you on your former examination in the Federal Court state that it was not your practice to examine engines with this torch, that no torches were supplied you for that purpose, no oil was given you for that purpose, no pole was given you for that purpose, to examine even engines of this same type, but that you made this particular examination because of this prior accusation? Isn't that what you stated?

A. Nobody can understand that.

Q. Didn't you make that statement?

By the Court:

Do you understand that question?

Witness:

I don't clearly understand it.

Q. I will ask another one. You were on the witness stand before, weren't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you were testifying before, didn't you state that even with engines of this type with the high brick arch that it was not your practice to examine them with a torch, that no torch was furnished you for the purpose, that no waste was furnished you for the purpose, no oil was furnished you for the purpose, but that you did make this examination because of that prior accusation? Didn't you state that?

A. I don't know. But oil and stuff is furnished to us, or
[382] anything that we want, so that we do not carry it home.

By the Court:

He is asking you what you said when you testified before in the United States Court.

Witness:

What did I say?

PAGE CUT OFF

By the Court:

He is asking you if you did not say in the United States Court that it was not your practice to examine engines with high brick arches because no oil, no pole, no torch, was furnished you. He is not asking you what was furnished you, but he is asking you whether you said that in the United States Court. Do you understand it now?

Witness:

No, sir.

By the Court:

Mr. Morris, read the question to him very slowly.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

Witness:

I don't know whether I did or not.

Q. You don't know whether you did or not?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, I know you don't want to do anything that isn't right in the case. How many of these high engines—how many times in your experience with the Virginian Railroad do you reckon you ever examined with a torch?

A. I don't know; but a good many of them.

Q. As many as half a dozen times?

A. Each time.

Q. Do you suppose you ever did that as much as six times in your life?

A. To each engine?

[383] Q. No; with all engines of that type?

A. Yes, sir; more than that.

Q. More than six times?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did it as many as half a dozen times altogether, you reckon?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, now, how many times do you ever reckon you did that?

A. I can not count it up.

Q. Well, approximately?

A. It has been going on for a good while.

Q. Approximately speaking, how many times do you suppose you ever did that?

A. It depends on how many trips the engines make.

Q. I am not talking about what it depends on, I am talking about the number of times you have done it; how many times do you suppose you have done that?

Q. How many times do you suppose you have ever examined engines with high brick arches, with torches?

A. I do not know how many times, but a good many times.

By Mr. Hunt:

Mr. Hall, would you mind letting me have the record of the evidence taken down by the stenographer when this witness was on the stand in the Federal Court in Roanoke? I would like to see what he did say in regard to the question that I have asked him about.

By Mr. Hall:

I will see the evidence and let you know later.

[After recess counsel for defendant (Mr. Hall) handed the evidence asked for above to counsel for the plaintiff.]

[384] (Witness stands aside.)

[385] W. J. PHARR, RECALLED.

W. J. Pharr, recalled, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You identified Mr. Andrews' report of November the 13th, 1912, when you were on the witness stand before, I believe?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The work required on that report was, "Tighten Knuckle Pin, Right Front, Renew Side Rod Bushing to Driver No. 2, Right Side." I wish you would state whether or not the knuckle pin, right front, had anything to do with the crown-sheet or the injector or water glass or water cocks?

A. Not a thing in the world, sir.

Q. The next thing is renew side rod bushing to driver No. 2, right side. That had nothing to do with any of those things, did it?

A. That is underneath the whole business; that is the machinery part; this is on the boiler.

Q. "Set up Wedges"?

A. That is underneath the edging.

Q. It had nothing to do with the boiler or any of its appliances?

A. No, sir.

Q. "Overhaul lubricator, to air reverser." That had nothing to do with the boiler or any of its appliances, did it?

A. No, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. The steam ram of the right injector did have something to do with the boiler?

A. It wouldn't have anything to do with the injector, only a little steam escaped there, and we packed that with asbestos.

Q. The amount of steam that would escape depends on how much it gets out of fix?

A. No, sir; if you take all of the packing out of it, it
[386] wouldn't have anything to do with it.

Q. You think it would work all right if you took it all out?

A. Yes, sir; I am certain it would.

Q. You think the injector was in good shape, then?

A. I don't know of any reason why it should not be; there was no report on it.

Q. It certainly ought to force plenty of water in the boiler if it was?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[387] R. H. SCOTT.

R. H. Scott, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q Were you employed as a conductor by the Virginian Railway at the time this accident to Mr. Andrews occurred?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are still employed in that capacity, are you not, by the same company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have charge of this train that Mr. Andrews' engine was pulling at the time the explosion occurred?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What time did you report for duty that evening before

leaving Roanoke on the 14th of November, 1912?

A. 9 o'clock.

Q. Did you come in on that train?

A. Yes, sir; which way do you mean?

Q. From Princeton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have that engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Coming in?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was running it?

A. Mr. Andrews.

Q. Can you state after November 11th what trips that engine made until the time of this explosion?

A. Yes, sir; by looking at my book.

[388] Q. I wish you would look at your book and tell what the first trip was that you made on or after November the 11th?

A. We left Princeton on the 11th and arrived at Roanoke on the 12th.

Q. What time did you leave Princeton on the 11th?

A. 9:45 p. m.

Q. And you arrived at Roanoke when?

A. 9:30 a. m. of the 12th.

Q. When did you go back to Roanoke?

A. We left Roanoke 6:15 p. m. of the 12th and arrived in Princeton 7:20 a. m. the 13th.

Q. Now, on that trip from Princeton to Roanoke and return, was your train pulled by engine 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Andrews the engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, when did you leave Princeton again?

A. We left there 10:30 p. m. of the 13th and arrived in Roanoke a. m. the 14th about 6:30; I haven't got the time on my book.

Q. You haven't got the time of arrival in your book in Roanoke on the morning of the 14th?

A. No, sir.

Q. When you were called to report for duty on the evening of the 14th to take the train out, did you find Mr. Andrews there when you came?

A. Yes, sir; I met him at Franklin Road.

[389] Q. Was he on his engine then?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the engine hitched to the train?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see Mr. Andrews make any examination of that engine or any part of it?

A. I saw him looking in the fire box after we got on the train.

Q. Where was that?

A. That was at the west end of the yard.

Q. Tell the jury how he did it?

A. He got down and took a shovel and held it up like this (indicating), and looked over into the fire box, down on his knees.

Q. Looked at the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir; he was looking up in there; I suppose he was looking at the crown-sheet.

Q. Is that the usual way engineers make an inspection of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You see them do it quite often, don't you?

A. Yes, sir; quite often.

Q. Then after you left the Roanoke yard was your train stopped anywhere between there and the point where the accident occurred?

A. No, sir.

Q. What was the first thing that you knew of the ac-
[390] cident?

A. The first I heard of it was the flagman made a remark, he said, "We have hit some one," and he walked out on the platform, and he said, "We have hit some one."

Q. It is not necessary to tell what he said, let us get along. Did you feel a check or anything like that?

A. No, sir; it was a very nice stop.

Q. What did you do then?

A. We heard them hollering and I went over to where I found them, and Mr. Walton was the first man I found.

Q. Where did you find Mr. Walton?

A. He was lying down the bank about fifteen or twenty feet from the train.

Q. On which side?

A. The left side coming west.

Q. He was thrown out on the fireman's side, was he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who did you find next?

A. Mr. Andrews.

Q. Where did you find him?

A. He was about three or four car lengths west of Mr. Walton, sitting up by the side of the track.

Q. Further on than Mr. Walton was?

A. Yes, sir; on the left side.

Q. Where did you find Mr. Lucas, the front brakeman?

A. Just across from Mr. Andrews, on the right side.

Q. On the right side?

A. Yes, sir.

[391] Q. Did you get up on the engine then?

A. Only up on the step, after I got some bed clothing and prepared to take care of them the best I could, I got up on the steps and I noticed one of the stoker holes being out and I looked through that and I saw no fire in the engine, and I went to the phone.

Q. Did Mr. Andrews ever make any statement to you about having been discharged from other railroads for burning crown-sheets?

A. I heard him say he lost the first job for burning an engine.

Q. How many railroads did he say had discharged him on account of burning engines?

A. I do not remember how many he said, and I do not remember what railroads they were.

Q. How far was the point of explosion west of Singer?

A. It was about two and one-half miles.

Q. How far is LaFayette west of Singer?

A. About a mile, very near a mile.

Q. How far from LaFayette is it to the point of this accident?

A. As well as I remember, where the mile post stands, about a mile and a half.

Q. Can you locate or identify the mile post close to which this explosion occurred?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is it?

A. Mile post 264, I think is the closest.

[392] Q. How near is it to mile post 264?

A. Very close to it, part of the train was standing about mile post 264.

Q. And the engine was on beyond that a little distance?

A. Yes, sir; a little distance.

Q. What time at night did this explosion occur?

A. 10:20.

Q. What kind of a train were you pulling?

A. Empties and three loads.

Q. How many empties?

A. I think I had eighty cars, I think it was.

Q. And a caboose?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you give us any idea how fast this train was running at the time it left Singer tank until the explosion occurred?

A. Between Singer tank and LaFayette we were making about fifteen or eighteen miles an hour, we struck the grade there and at the time of the accident we were making between eight and ten miles an hour.

Q. Is there a grade from LaFayette up to the point of the accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. State whether or not it is a heavy pull with a train such as you were pulling?

A. It is quite a heavy pull.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Scott, after this crown-sheet went down, the engine went how far?

A. They went about thirty or thirty-five car lengths, probably forty cars.

Q. They went probably forty cars after the pulling power of the engine had ceased altogether, didn't you?

[393] A. I don't know whether he had the engine shut off or not, there was still steam on it for a while.

Q. With that crown-sheet down you couldn't shut it off any shutter, could you? There isn't any way to shut it off any tighter?

A. I don't know how long it took the steam to escape, and it was a little down grade there.

Q. That is what I am coming to; it drifted for as much as forty cars after the entire pulling power of that engine was done away with, didn't it?

A. Yes; between thirty-five and forty.

Q. Then that wasn't a heavy pull there, was it?

A. No; we had gotten over the heavy pull, we were turning the grade.

Q. You had passed by the heavy pull at the time of this acci-

dent, hadn't you, up to that point?

A. We had passed that heavy pull.

Q. You passed all the heavy pulls up to that point at the
[394] time of that accident, didn't you?

A. Between there and Roanoke we had.

Q. That was the way the train was going?

A. Yes, sir; between there and Roanoke we had passed all the heavy pulls.

Q. When you went up to the engine you found Jerre first lying on the left side?

A. That is when I started over; yes, sir.

Q. Jerre was perfectly conscious, wasn't he?

A. So far as I know he was.

Q. Didn't he, while lying there in that condition, tell you that this engine had gone down when it was full of water?

Q. Answer the question.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Scott, who was present when Mr. Andrews told you that he had lost his position by reason of burning an engine?

A. Part of my crew.

Q. Name them.

A. I think Mr. Adams was one of them.

Q. Where is Mr. Adams?

A. Really, I don't know.

Q. You have no idea where he is?

A. No, sir; he has left here.

Q He has left and gone?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Name one that we can get hold of, if you can?

[395] A. I don't know where he is at, but the fireman, I have forgotten who the fireman was; if I could get hold of my books about that date I could tell you. You see, we had a crew, probably an extra crew about that time, and I don't remember who they were. We were sitting there talking.

Q. Mr. Walton was firing, wasn't he?

A. No, sir; I do not think he was at that time.

Q. When was it he told you that?

A. Two or three years ago.

Q. Two or three years before this accident?

A. A year, probably before the accident; we were sitting there talking about it.

Q. Where were you sitting?

A. At Fagg; under the water tank at Fagg.

Q. And you cannot recall who was present, but you can remember where you were sitting?

A. I remember Mr. Adams was braking for me at the time, but I do not remember who the other crew was.

Q. What impressed this fact upon your mind?

A. Which fact?

Q. The fact that he told you that he had lost his position by reason of burning an engine?

A. We were talking about the different railroads, Mr. Andrews and I. We met on the same railroad and we have been together nearly all the time except after he left the C. & O., until he got back to the Norfolk & Western. We were not separated, we were together on the Norfolk & Western and together on the Virginian
[396] most of the time.

Q. Did you run together much?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were put on the witness stand at the other trial by Mrs. Andrews' side as her witness?

A. I was summoned by both sides, but I am here to tell the truth as near as possible.

Q. You were on the witness stand before and put on by Mrs. Andrews before?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you or not state at that time to the court and jury that Mr. Andrews was regarded as one of the most careful and painstaking engineers in the service of the Virginian Railroad?

A. So far as my knowledge, and I say so right today.

Q. You say it now?

A. So far as I knew, he was a sober man.

Q. You said he was regarded as one of the best men on the road?

A. I do.

Q. You say that now?

A. Yes; I say he was a good man.

Q. Mr. Andrews was one of the regular engineers of the road, who had a regular assigned run, didn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The road has numerous engineers who act as substitutes, haven't they?

A. Yes, sir.

[397] Q. The best men are on the regular runs or supposed to be?

A. Not in all cases; no, sir. We have some extra men who are much better than the regular men.

Q. The oldest men in point of service?

A. The oldest men in the service get the preferred run.

Q. And he was one among the oldest men in the service?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were the conductor with Mr. Massie on the trip before Mr. Andrews took this engine back, weren't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was the same engine, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Didn't Mr. Massie, the engineer, have some trouble with that engine that day?

A. Coming east we did not have any steam, and we stopped a couple of times to blow up steam.

Q. That is rather an unusual occurrence, isn't it, when an engine is working properly?

A. I don't know anything about how the engine was working, that is out of my line.

Q. I say, having been a conductor for a number of years, it is an unusual occurrence for it to stop to blow up steam if the engine is working properly, isn't it?

A. That depends on the fireman. Some firemen, you know, cannot keep the engine hot.

Q. Jerre wasn't the fireman, was he?

[398] A. No, sir.

Q. Now, then, isn't it true that when your engine is working properly and the fireman doing his duty properly, that your stops on this trip before, when Mr. Massie was running the engine, on account of failure to get steam, was rather an unusual occurrence?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was?

A. Yes, sir.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You say you had to stop a couple of times on the previous trip when Mr. Massie was running the engine?

A. The trip that Mr. Massie was running.

Q. Was that prior to November the 11th?

A. I can see from my book.

Q. Just look at your book and state when it was.

A. It was on the 9th.

Q. Who was the fireman on that trip?

A. Mr. Carr.

Q. Do you know whether he was an experienced fireman or not?

A. I don't know how long he had been firing.

Q. I wish you would state whether or not it depended on the fireman to keep the steam up?

A. If the engine is in good condition and good coal, it
[399] depends on the fireman.

Q. And doesn't it sometimes happen that firemen sometimes let the fire get down?

A. Sometimes it happens that the fireman lets his fire get away from him.

Q. Does that occur often with a good fireman?

A. Sometimes.

Q. What do you do then?

A. Sometimes we have to stop until he can build the fire up, and if we haven't a very heavy grade we can lighten up on the throttle and let him catch up, providing he hasn't let the water get away from him.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You have your book there showing the time when you leave and arrive at destinations, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell on this trip with Mr. Massie whether you were going east or west, the time you had the trouble?

A. Coming east.

Q. Will you look at your book and tell when you left Princeton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please do so.

A. We left Princeton at 2:30 p. m.

Q. On the 9th?

[400] A. Yes, sir.

A. And got to Roanoke at when?

A. 5:10 a. m. of the 10th.

Q. How many hours is that behind the usual run?

A. At that time we generally made the run about ten or eleven hours.

Q. And this consumed how many hours?

A. 2:30 to 5:10.

Q. About thirteen hours?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was about three hours delayed by reason of the trouble which you had with the engine on that trip, fourteen hours and forty minutes, to be accurate?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You lost about four hours and forty minutes on that trip by reason of the trouble you had with the engine?

A. It was not necessary for it all to be that, probably we had some meets, and got delayed on that.

Q. Will your book show meet orders?

A. No, sir.

Q. If you lost time for any other reason on that trip except the trouble you had with the engine, you have no knowledge of it?

A. No, sir; I don't remember of it.

Q. Isn't it true that the fireman, the oldest fireman in point of service, are also given regular runs?

A. Yes, sir; they get in their run.

[401] Q. Then the fireman that Mr. Massie had with him, from the point of service, at least, was one of the oldest firemen on the road, wasn't he?

A. No, sir; he was an extra fireman.

Q. He was extra?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He wasn't on his regular run?

A. He has no train, just an extra man, used in emergency.

Q. Who was Mr. Massie's regular fireman?

A. Mr. Mason.

Q. What was the fireman's name in this instance?

A. You mean that was with Mr. Massie?

Q. Yes.

A. Mr. Carr.

Q. Is that the Mr. Carr who was on the witness stand awhile ago?

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Carr is not here, is he?

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Adams is not here?

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Massie is not here, is he?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Scott, that wasn't Mr. Massie's regular engine, was it?

A. No, sir; Mr. Massie was an extra man.

[402] Q. He was an extra man?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why did he happen to be running that trip, do you recall?

A. I suppose he stood first out on the extra list and Mr. Andrews was off.

Q. Does your record show how much time you actually stopped to blow up steam?

A. Not on my book; but you will find the report in the superintendent's office.

Q. Have you any recollection of how much time you actually lost by blowing up steam on that trip?

A. No, sir; I do not recollect exactly how much.

(Witness stands aside.)

(The court takes a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1914, 2 P. M.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

Continuation of the evidence on behalf of the defendant, in chief.

[403] H. L. THOMAS.

H. L. Thomas, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You are employed by the Virginian Railway, are you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was your occupation on the 14th day of November, 1912?

A. Engineer.

Q. For the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go to the place where this wreck occurred?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was there before you?

A. Conductor Scott.

Q. So you were the second man who got there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you examine the engine when you got to the scene of the wreck?

A. Yes, sir; I got up on the engine.

Q. Did you find the window on the right hand side of the cab, that is, the engineer's side, open or closed?

A. I found it closed.

Q. Did you examine the injectors?

A. Yes, sir.

[404] Q. In what position did you find those injectors?

A. I found both injectors, the water valves open and the steam valve open also.

Q. Was that the proper position for throwing water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; if they had been put on properly.

Q. Did you hitch your engine to this train and carry it on?

A. I taken it to Fagg.

Q. And there you turned it over to another engineer?

A. I didn't turn it over to anybody, not my engine.

Q. The engine was taken to Princeton by some other engineer, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been an engineer?

A. Three years and six months.

Q. And before that I suppose you fired?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long?

A. Four years.

Q. What is the custom of engineers as to the inspection of the crown-sheet when they take charge of an engine?

A. The custom of engineers when they get on the engine is to turn the blower on, open the fire box door and get down on their knees or stoop over in position so that they can see the crown-sheet.

Q. Do they always do that when they first take charge [405] of an engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can a man who is firing an engine along on the road running through country such as between Roanoke and the point of this

accident, examine the crown-sheet of his boiler without getting down on his knees and looking in?

A. No, sir.

Q. Can he do it while he is simply throwing coal into the fire box without stooping and getting down on his knees?

A. No, sir.

Q. In this kind of a country, can a fireman from his position on the inside of the engine, or from his position down in the pit where he is firing, hear the injector working when the window on the right side of the cab is closed?

A. No, sir.

Q. Can the engineer tell?

A. No, sir; the exhaust of the engine kills the sound of the injector.

Q. In what distance will the water in a boiler of an engine of the class engine 469 become exhausted when that engine is running between Singer and the point of the accident and the water glass showed water within half an inch of the top of the glass, the engine pulling a train of about eighty cars?

Plaintiff objected.

Q. Very well, I will ask another question. Have you observed the water in your engine, how often the water in the boiler has to be renewed under working conditions?

A. I have never tried that.

[406] Q. You have never tried that particular experiment?

A. No, sir.

Q. But is it your custom and practice to keep a check on your water and does your practice give you an idea of how soon water in the boiler will be exhausted where the injector is not supplying water?

Plaintiff objected.

Q. Very well, I will change it and will not use the word "idea" but will say "knowledge". Does it?

A. As I said, I never kept the injector off for any length of time, but by having the injector shut off when we started the train and noticing the water that way I would judge it would take—

A. With the injector shut clean off, are you talking about?

Q. With the injector not throwing water into the boiler.

A. With the injector not putting water in your boiler?

Q. What I want to know is, do you know, have you knowl-

[407] edge of how fast water is consumed in your engine under working conditions?

A. Well, I just don't exactly understand what you mean; you are trying to say how much water he had in this glass when he passed Singer tank?

Q. No; here is what I want to know: whether or not your experience as an engineer has given you any knowledge as to how rapidly your engine will consume water, as to how long a tank of water will last.

A. How long a tank of water will last?

Q. Yes; under working conditions, when you are working under steam?

A. Not ever having an injector shut off in order to try it, I couldn't say.

Q. Is this a hard place to keep water in your boiler?

By Mr. Staples:

What?

Q. From Singer to Iron to, or to the point of accident?

A. No, sir; not an unreasonably hard place; it depends on how a man will be working his engine.

Q. If his engine is not working right, will the water get out of the boiler easily?

A. No, sir.

Q. My question was, if the engineer does not work his injector and the engine properly, is it or not a place that will knock the water out of the engine quickly?

A. If he does not work his engine properly?

Q. Yes, sir.

[408] A. If he is going through there running at any rate of speed, which we do through this country about fifteen or eighteen miles an hour, and his engine is not working properly, you would exhaust the water quicker than if you were working the water properly or working your engine properly.

Q. How do you tell whether the injector is working properly and throwing water into the boiler?

A. When your engine is running they have a little overflow pipe as I call it, right under the cab, and you can look down and see whether it is picking up all the water around, if not picking up all, some of it will be running out of this little pipe.

Q. Do you have to put your head out of the window to see that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you see it with the cab window shut?

A. No, sir.

Q. In ordinary work, how many injectors would an engineer use?

A. One.

Q. Is one injector sufficient to keep enough water in the boiler for ordinary purposes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could two be used at this point, under ordinary circumstances, without flooding the boiler?

A. That depends on where he had his water in his boiler.

[409] Q. I mean if the water in the boiler was at the regular height, as the witness here has testified to ,within a half an inch of the top of the glass?

A. The second injector would get too much water and it would also get your steam so low that you wouldn't be able to pull your train up over this grade.

Q. Ordinarily, does the engineer work the injector on the left hand side of his engine, or does he have the fireman work it?

A. Ordinarily he has the fireman to work it.

[410] Q. Under what circumstances would an engineer put the injector on, on the left hand side of the engine, himself, and not call on his fireman to do it?

A. In case his right injector was working all right?

Q. Yes, sir; in case the right injector was working all right.

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to the question because he is taking into consideration the personality of the engineer.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepted.

[411] A. In case the right hand injector was working all right, you mean?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Under what condition would an engineer put on his left injector himself?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, he would be kind of what you might call excited and wouldn't feel like depending on his fireman to put this injector on; he would fell like his fireman wouldn't put it on like he would and he would want it on right.

By Mr. Hunt:

We ask to exclude that answer.

By the Court:

Q. Suppose the water in that boiler had reached a point where it still covered the crown-sheet and the engineer wanted to use both of these injectors at the same time, would that show excitement?

A. If he thought his water was about to get off his crown-sheet, it would; yes, sir.

Q. Would it show excitement for him to put it on?

A. Yes, sir; he go over and put it on himself and not depend on his fireman to put it on at all.

Q. Would it show excitement for him to go and do a thing himself rather than to instruct somebody else to do it if the water was getting very low on the crown-sheet or if he discovered the water was getting very low on the crown-sheet?

[412] A. Yes, sir; he would do it himself; the engineer would put it on himself.

Q. Would you put it on yourself under those circumstances?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would that show excitement on your part?

A. To a certain extent; yes, sir.

Q. Wouldn't it be excitement which was perfectly proper, it wouldn't show you were rattled, would it? Do you mean by excitement you would be rattled or be very diligent?

A. It means I wouldn't have any confidence in the fireman to get the injector to work and therefore I would go and put it on myself.

Mr. Wingfield continuing direct examination:

Q. If the water was just getting down a little bit from the top and you wanted to get it up, would you call over to your fireman to put that other injector on or go yourself?

A. No, sir; I would get the fireman to put it on then.

By the Court:

I do not think the evidence is proper as to what a man would do under certain conditions.

Q. What would the average engineer do under those circumstances?

[413] Q. Mr. Thomas, if an engineer discovers that his water is getting low as to present the danger of leaving his crown-sheet uncovered, and of the water getting below the crown-sheet, and he wants to put on his left injector, the right one being on,

would he call to the fireman to put that left injector on or would he go across and put it on himself?

Plaintiff objected. Objection sustained. Defendant excepted.

[414] Q. Now, Mr. Thomas, where are the injectors?

A. They are outside right under your cab window.

Q. And where are the pipes leading into the boiler from the injectors?

A. They run from the injectors outside up through or what we call the running board, outside the front of the cab window.

Q. And not inside the cab?

A. No, sir.

Q. How does this injector work? I mean by that, does the engineer have to adjust the valve to throw water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; he has to adjust the water valve for this reason, if your engineer had 180 pounds of steam on it you have your water valve opened, and if your steam varies from 180 pounds say back to 160, you have to cut your water valve down.

Q. Does an engineer have to prime the injector valve?

A. Yes, sir; if he pulls the steam valve open, as we call it, too quick, it will blow the water through your overflow; but if you open it gradually and let it unite it will go into the boiler.

Q. Under what circumstances may the injector be working and no water going into the boiler?

A. By having too much steam or too much water for your steam, or not enough steam for your water.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You say the injector is working then, you mean not working then, although the steam is turned on, don't you?

A. What do you mean?

Q. You said the injector may be working and no water going into the boiler. You mean the injector had failed to work, don't you, although the steam and water were both turned on?

A. If it was turned on properly.

[415] Q. It wouldn't work although they were turned on improperly?

A. If it was turned on improperly they wouldn't work.

Q. You say that Conductor Scott was on the engine before you. You don't know what he did there, do you?

A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. You don't know whether he monkeyed around with the left injector to find out whether it was on or not, do you?

A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. You don't know anything as to what Mr. Fitzgerald did when he was there, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. He was there ahead of you, wasn't he?

A. No, sir.

Q. Who was Fitzgerald?

A. He is an engineman.

Q. Wasn't he there about that time?

[416] A. Yes, sir; I was on the engine that came down the hill ahead of his engine and as soon as we coupled up I got off my engine and got up on Mr. Andrews' engine, and Mr. Fitzgerald, as I was going back to my engine, was coming to look at it.

Q. And you say that Mr. Fitzgerald was not there before you?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Thomas, if an engineer starts his injector to working and running his engine along and the water creeps gradually up and up and up in his water glass, that shows it is working, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the steam pressure in the boiler of the engine keeps up sufficiently to keep the engine running, there is no reason why the water should stop flowing through the injector, is there?

A. No, sir.

Q. If an engine leaves Roanoke and the injector is put on as it leaves, the right injector, and the water in the water glass continually rises and shows that the water in the boiler is continuing to increase, doesn't that show necessarily that the injector is working?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if it is that way all the way to Singer water tank that shows the injector is working when it hits Singer water tank?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Unless it is turned off it shows that it is bound to keep

[417] on working after it leaves Singer water tank, doesn't it, Mr. Thomas?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say an engineer always stoops down when he gets on the engine. Does he always do that?

A. Stoops down to look at his crown-sheet.

Q. Does he always look at his crown-sheet?

A. All engineers ever I fired for and all engineers ever I was on an engine with, as well as myself, always inspect the crown-sheet the first thing.

Q. You mean if you inspect the crown-sheet you couldn't see much in there; you cannot tell much about it looking at it that way, can you; you can't tell much about it looking at it across a fire in your face and the red glare in the fire box; you can't tell much about the crown-sheet by looking at it that way?

A. You can tell whether it has been burned or not.

Q. How can you tell whether it has been burned or not; you say you can tell that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How would you tell?

A. Usually when they have been burned there is a leak around the crown-bolts.

Q. You mean you can tell whether it is leaking or not?

A. You can tell whether it has been burned by the leaks [418] around the bolts.

Q. Suppose it did not leak?

A. Then you could tell by the color of the crown-sheet.

Q. What color would it be?

A. In its original color it is a black sooty looking, and then if it was burned it would have a blue indication.

Q. And you think that with all that red glare in your face, the fire box full of smoke and glare, you could detect the difference between blue and black?

A. We don't usually have that kind of a fire when we get on the engine; we turn the blower on so you can see your crown-sheet.

Q. Did you ever look in the fire box and see it burned that way?

A. No, sir.

Q. What makes you think it could be done?

A. By looking at this one over here.

Q. You base your opinion on that?

A. By telling whether the crown-sheet is burned or not.

Q. And you never have detected anything wrong with a crown-sheet as far as the color is concerned by looking in there, in the way you have described?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, the grade from Singer tank to the point of this accident is a good grade, isn't it?

A. From Singer to the point of this accident?

Q. Yes, sir; it is a good easy running grade, isn't it?

A. By Sheriff Martin's house it is a pretty steep pull.

[419] Q. How long a pull is that?

A. I should judge it was about not quite half a mile.

Q. The balance of it is good running, isn't it?

A. It is kinder level.

Q. It is kinder level all the balance of the way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If an engineer quits his post of duty and goes and turns on the injector on the fireman's side, would the fireman be mighty apt to know that?

A. I do not see any reason why he should not.

Q. He is sitting right there by it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Particularly if he had been firing there just four or five seconds before the crown-sheet goes down he certainly ought to know whether the engineer was over there turning that thing on at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He couldn't hardly help from knowing, could he?

A. I don't see how he could.

Q. If an engineer discovered the water in his boiler was low he would tell the fireman about it; he wouldn't have him there exposing his life to danger without telling him, if there was any danger of blowing him up?

Defendant objected. Question withdrawn.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. Suppose the fireman was leaning out of the window, had his head out of the window, could he tell?

A. The water valve is so close to the fireman's seat box and him being on the seat box, the engineer would be bound to strike him somewhere in putting the injector on.

[420] Q. Even with his head leaning out of the window?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you look into the fire box and inspect the engine before making a run, can you see the crown-sheet clearly and distinctly?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And observe its color?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When the injector is put on and the engine continues to steam, if the pressure of the steam should fall down or should increase, would that effect the flow of water through the injector into the boiler?

A. Not unless you changed the water valve, if the steam fell down as low as 160 pounds, you would have to change your water valve.

Q. If you did not change it would the water continue to go into the boiler?

A. A part of it would.

Q. But not as much?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then the injector could still be working and you would be wasting the water?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the engineer should happen to cut the injector off
[421] for any reason during his trip, would it or would not it be necessary for him to put it on properly again before it would throw water into the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; he would have to put it on properly.

Q. If he did not put it on properly, it would not throw water into the boiler, would it?

A. No, sir.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You don't mean to say there is anything complicated about an injector, do you? It is a simple thing?

A. It is a simple injector, it is one of the most simple injectors I ever saw.

Q. Any engineer can work them, can't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. There is no trouble doing it, is there?

A. I don't see why he could not if he has had any experience at all.

Q. Even a hostler can do it, can't he?

A. Yes, sir; they do put it on.

Q. If the steam remains up about the popping off point, and the water and steam valves open, it is bound to throw water into the boiler, if it started doing that in the beginning?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. If the water ram is wide open, under those circumstances would it put water into the boiler?

A. With the engine hot?

[422] Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When the water ram is wide open?

A. Yes, sir; when the water ram is wide open.

(Witness stands aside.)

[423] R. H. SCOTT, RECALLED.

R. H. Scott, recalled, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. When you got on this engine after the explosion, did you put the left injector on?

A. No, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. One question I neglected to ask you when you were on the witness stand before, when you saw Mr. Andrews looking in the fire box, did he have any torch there to help him see?

A. No, sir.

Q. That was just a few minutes after this hostler had turned it over to him, wasn't it?

A. I don't know what time the hostler turned the engine over to him.

Q. He said he turned it over to him just before he went?

A. It was fifteen minutes after my reporting time when he looked in the fire box.

Q. He didn't have any torch, did he?

A. No, sir.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. How long was Mr. Andrews required to report ahead of you?

A. Fifteen minutes.

Q. And it was fifteen minutes after you had reported
[424] that you saw him?

A. Yes, sir; fifteen minutes after I reported.

Q. When you saw him examining his crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he put the blower on?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What effect does that have?

A. I understand from the engineers that it gets rid of the smoke.

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to that.

Q. Do you know?

A. No, sir.

Q. You do know that he put the blower on when he examined the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[425] C. L. RICHARDSON.

C. L. Richardson, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Are you an engineer on the Virginian Railroad?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you run engines of the same kind as 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your regular engine?

A. 479.

Q. Were you running an engine of that order at the time and before the accident to Mr. Andrews?

A. Yes, sir; I was assigned an engine of the same class that I was working that day; no, I think I was working 468 at the time.

Q. And that was the same type of engine that Mr. Andrews was running?

A. Yes, sir; it came in the same class.

Q. Are you familiar with the operation of the injector on that type of engine?

A. Yes, sir; pretty familiar with them.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury what the injector depends on? I mean the working of the injector when it will throw water in the boiler and when it will not?

A. That is of engines that I have run?

Q. Yes; of that same type, and same kind of injector, if yours had the same kind.

A. I find that if they are properly primed they work all right. Of course, you can pull them a little bit too sudden and they will break, you can also have your water valve and let it run wide open, and if you start your injector working properly and if your
[426] water valve runs wide open it will get too much for the amount of steam and condense it, and therefore the injector will work improperly. You can allow that water valve to close up on you and you are getting too much steam for the amount of water you are getting, and it will cause it to work improperly.

Q. What valves does an engineer have to work in order to put the injector on and regulate it?

A. He has a steam valve and a water valve.

Q. Are they two distinct and separate valves?

A. Yes, sir; one in front of him and one by the side of him.

Q. How do you operate each one of them?

A. You open the water valve whatever amount you want to open it, as wide as you want, and when you get to that point you generally reach up and get your steam valve for a second like that (indicating) and pull it on back, that is, it depends on how much steam you have got, but you just reach up and stop it for a second and keep on back with it.

Q. Now, in working those valves and in attempting to put on steam, do you ever fail to catch water and throw it in the boiler?

A. I have.

Q. Does that occur frequently?

A. No, sir.

[427] Q. Or sometimes, or how often?

A. It occurs sometimes, it will occur frequently with one injector and again you can run that round trip or two and it won't occur.

Q. Does the operation of the injector in the first place depend on whether it is properly primed or not?

A. It certainly does, that is the experience I have had with an engine.

Q. Even after you get it in proportion with the regular steam

pressure of 185 pounds say, does it depend on keeping these valves properly adjusted to make it continue to work?

A. I just now said if you let the water valve, when starting to work, get too much water it won't work right; if you draw it right back, it won't work right it will break the injector to a certain extent.

Q. When an engine is running, pulling a train of 80 cars between Singer and the point of this accident, can you tell whether the injector is working or not by the sound of it?

A. No, sir.

Q. How can you tell?

A. My experience with that is I have to keep my eye on the business, I have to watch the water glass, and if I see it works a little sluggish for five or ten minutes I run over and blow it and if not satisfied I reach out and try the water guage.

Q. What test does he make to determine whether he has [428] got water in the boiler?

A. How does he determine whether he has got water in his boiler?

Q. Yes.

A. From experience, I have several ways.

Q. What are those several ways?

A. You can get so much in there, you can throw it out of the stack, that is a mighty poor indication.

Q. What I want to know is whether he has anything in addition to the water glass to tell whether the boiler has got water or not?

A. Yes, sir; he has three guage cocks.

Q. Which is the most certain and the most accurate way of telling whether there is water in the boiler or not?

A. The guage cocks.

Q. With the window closed, running between Singer and the point of this accident, could the engineer tell whether his injector was working properly or not?

A. I do not see how he can, unless he kept his eye on the water glass and guage cocks to see they were maintaining the required amount of water in the engine. I can tell by the singing, that is, if everything is working nice and favorably, it does that, some engines will knock and pound, and some will run along smoothly. Some injectors are brand new and they will sing for you. There is a dozen different ways I can tell from the eleven years I have been running, and I just have to use my best judgment, and I never depend on the singing of the injector as to whether it is working or not.

[429] Q. Can you or not tell by the singing of the injector with

the engine running?

A. No; I cannot tell.

Q. What kind of a place is it between Singer and the point where this accident occurred, with reference to keeping water in the boiler, is it easy or hard?

A. It depends on the working of the engine, a man doing what you call hogging an engine, it is hard; if he is running his engine smoothly, it is not a very hard place to keep water in the engine.

Q. Have you ever tried your engine to see how long it would take you running water out of the boiler when you had water within an inch of the top of your water glass when you passed Singer tank?

A. Yes, sir; I have done it just experimenting with it.

Q. When?

A. I done it here last week; I have done it three times in the last year.

Q. What result did you find?

Plaintiff objected.

By the Court:

Those tests had to be under similar conditions.

Q. Were you running the engine under working steam pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you tried it?

A. Yes, sir.

[430] Q. Did you have the same class of engine as this one?

A. Yes, sir; the same class, No. 479.

Q. Pulling the same character of train?

A. No, sir; I was pulling a little heavier train.

Q. Each time?

A. Pulling what we call—they have raised the tonnage on us five cars. Now, I am mistaken; one time we had a regular train, and the other two times we had five cars more.

Q. The time you had the same kind of a train, I wish that you would tell the jury how long it took you to run your water down after you left Singer tank?

Plaintiff objected.

Q. What kind of a train were you pulling?

A. Equal to 85 empties then; now we are pulling what we call equal to 90.

By Mr. Staples:

How many empties were they hauling at the time of the accident?

Witness:

85.

By Mr. Staples:

How do you know?

Witness:

That was our tonnage at that time.

By Mr. Staples:

How do you know this train was run according to the regular tonnage?

Witness:

Which, 469?

By Mr. Staples:

Yes.

Witness:

I don't know that; I can't say anything about that; the train I thought you were talking about was my train.

[431] Q. That train had 80 cars, consisting of three loaded cars; I wish you would state whether or not that would be equal to 85 empty cars?

A. Was that what 469 had?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. He had 80 empties and three loads?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. That is a half a car over 85 empties; you allow two empties for one load.

Q. Go ahead and answer the question.

A. I want the jury and all to understand that I don't know anything about 469; I am telling what I done with 479. Engines vary a lot in different things; I have run 479 passing there just for an experiment in it and just to see what I could do with it with the water between one-half to one inch of the top of the glass coming along by Singer water tank, making between eighteen and twenty miles an hour, and there is a road crossing just this side of Sheriff Martin's house, and every time—I did not miss it, you might say fifty or

seventy-five yards by putting my injector on at the same
[432] place. Now, of course, I put it on there because I did not feel it was safe to dip over in that hole and keep on going. I did not run it down extremely low or anything like that; I just done it to see how much water would get out of the glass.

Q. How low did your water get?

A. To one guage.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. That is the bottom guage cock, that allows you about three inches, I believe, is what boilermakers say, above the crown-sheet.

Q. How far is that road crossing that you speak of east of Sheriff Martin's house from the point where this explosion occurred?

A. I would say along between—I don't know whether it is hardly a mile or a little over a mile.

Q. Just about a mile?

A. Yes, sir; that is to where I have been told where the accident taken place and where I have seen indications of the cinders and things.

Q. In running an engine up that grade from Singer tank to west of where this explosion occurred, would the engineer ordinarily have two injectors on?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why wouldn't he have two injectors on?

A. The grade is not heavy enough and he does not work his engine hard enough, you might say he has to lighten up his engine to go over the Norfolk & Western viaduct, he shortens the stroke
[433] of his valve and don't use as much water or coal going fifteen or twenty miles an hour and he doesn't need both injectors.

Q. Suppose he did, what effect would it have?

A. It would kill the steam pressure back, it would knock your steam pressure back and the train would begin to drag.

Q. Is there any way that both of those injectors could get put on, that is the steam valve be pulled back and the water valve turned on without somebody doing it?

A. How is that question?

Q. I say, is there any way that an injector on the left side could have been put on, the water valve opened and the steam valve opened, properly, to make it work, without somebody operating those valves and putting them on?

A. There is no way they would get opened unless you would put them on yourself, unless you pulled that steam valve open and opened

the water valve; that is, if you are going to work the injector, there is no way to get it.

Q. Could an explosion have put them on?

A. I don't see any way that an explosion could have put them on that way, unless the steam has been exploded like that; you might come and throw that main steam turret open, the water valve turns like this (indicating), screws down, if that steam pressure came out there through the branch pipe under the chuck and hit it, it might throw it open, but when it done that it would blow the hose off.

Q. What is the custom among engineers in reference to
[434] inspecting their crown-sheets before they start out on a run?

A. They always—I can only speak for myself, I never do fool around an engine, I always go to an engine, and the first thing I do is to put on the blower and look in it.

Q. What do the rules of the Company require an engineer in that regard to do?

A. They require him to look after his crown-sheet and look after any part of the work he has reported on the previous trip, coming in, to see whether it is done or not.

Q. Are you familiar with the rules that were in force at that time?

A. Which time is that?

Q. At the time of this accident?

A. I am tolerable, I might be a little rusty on some of them.

Q. Is that a rule book that was in force at that time?

A. 1912?

Q. Yes.

A. "The Deepwater and Tidewater Railway Company". I got a rule book exactly like this one; it is what is called the standard book of rules. I think Mr. Welborn gave it to me.

Q. Was that in force at that time?

A. 1912?

Q. Yes, November the 14th, 1912?

A. If they made any change I wasn't notified.

Q. I call your attention to rule 702, under "Instructions
[435] to Enginemen". I wish you would look at that and see if that rule was in force at that time.

A. Rule 702?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir; that was in force at that time.

Q. I also call your attention to rule 729, and ask you whether or not that rule was in force at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Wingfield:

We now desire to offer those rules in evidence, and want to read them to the jury.

(Said rules, Nos. 702 and 729, are here introduced in evidence, read to the jury and are as follows:)

By Mr. Wingfield:

702, under Instructions to Engineers. The head of it is "Instructions to Enginemen". Rule 701 starts out, "Obey orders of the conductor as to starting, stopping, etc.'" and 702, is as follows:

"702. Be responsible for the proper care and safe management of the engine; the proper condition of all tools and signal appliances upon the same; the exact observance of all signals and other precautions established for the safety of trains; the avoidance of all risks, or any trouble on account of misplaced switches; the regularity of speed between stations; the charge and safety of the train, if the conductor is disabled, until properly relieved; the economical use of fuel and other supplies; the examination of bulletin boards before and after each trip; the careful and frequent inspection of the engine before, during and after each trip; the proper attachment of bell cord to cab gong or whistle before starting....."

And so forth. I will not read the rest of it unless the gentlemen want me to.

By Mr. Staples:

Does it say anything about the crown-sheet?

By Mr. Wingfield:

No, sir; it says proper inspection of the engine, before, during and after each trip. Now 729 is as follows:

"729. Report to the master mechanic any defects or improper condition of engine seen before starting with train. After each trip make a thorough inspection and report anything found not in good condition or needing repair; also state what light repairs have been made by engineer. Report in detail every injury or breakage happening to the engine while running train, or in service on the road or in yards. This report must be made before going off duty at the end of each trip."

[436] Now, does an engineer in compliance with those rules make an inspection before going off the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He also makes an inspection before starting out with it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Walton said that the injectors on this engine were inside the cab and the pipe leading from the injector to the boiler was inside the cab. What do you say about that?

A. I say they must have changed it from the last time I seen it, all the rest of them.

Q. Where have they always been?

A. Right between the engine and tank; they have a non-lifting injector on that engine.

Q. On the outside of the cab?

[437] A. Yes, sir; on the outside of the cab.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Where are the valves which the engineer handles to control that injector? Are they on the inside or outside of the cab?

A. On the inside.

Q. Engineers do not have to go outside of the cab to handle that injector at all, do they?

A. No, sir.

Q. Suppose an engine leaves Roanoke City with one injector on and the water glass shows a steady increase of water up to the point of Singer tank, and the injector not changed from there to the point of this accident, which is, I understand, about between two and three miles from Singer tank. Would you say that one injector was sufficient to throw enough water in there, with that load you have described, of 80 cars, or not?

A. The only way I can answer this question is according to my own experiments with them.

Q. Don't you know, generally speaking, whether that is true?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the jury whether that is a fact?

A. If I got an injector and I passed Singer tank and it is working and has increased in water, has gained water in that boiler from Roanoke to Singer, when I hit Singer water tank, and

[438] it has got more water in it at that time than he had when I came by Salem and the injector had never been shut off, it is an evident fact that the injector is in first-class shape and throwing plenty of water.

Q. And you rely on that one injector, don't you?

A. I do not only rely on the injector, but I also watch my water level.

Q. You watch the glass?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is put there for the engineer to watch, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the glass showed again from Roanoke to Singer tank, puts it to that point with that same load on, is there any reason in the world why that same condition undisturbed should not carry that train on if the crown-sheet and bolts were in proper condition? If it is, tell the jury.

A. If which?

Q. Read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

Q. Can you see any reason in the world why it should not?

A. The fact that the injector wasn't disturbed and nothing in the world done to the injector, you say?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. And nothing got stopped up about it?

Q. Nothing.

A. Everything working in perfect shape?

[439] Q. Yes, sir.

A. And the crown bolts in first-class shape and the crown-sheet in first-class shape?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. If you have all that stuff it takes it right into Princeton; I do not see why it should not do it.

Q. If the crown-sheet or bolts are defective, that brings about a different condition?

A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. If the injector gets stopped up, when you get that same steam turned on it, from Roanoke to Singer tank, that is something the engineer cannot control?

A. How is that?

Q. If the injector gets stopped up for any reason in running from Roanoke to Singer tank, showing that increase of water, that is something the engineer cannot control, if it does get stopped up?

A. He cannot control it while the engine is moving, he can stop and control it.

Q. He couldn't control it while the engine is going, at least?

281

A. No, sir; he can control the supply of that water while the engine is working.

Q. I don't mean that, but I mean if something gets wrong with the injector which supplies the flow of water, his water glass would have told him, wouldn't it?

A. His water glass or injector, one or the other will tell [440] him, then he has got to stop.

Q. He would not be told from the injector itself, would he?

A. I don't reckon he would, at least I wouldn't, at least I never have, I wouldn't say I wouldn't, but I never have.

Q. You don't think you would be told by the injector itself, would you?

A. I don't see why I would.

Q. In these experiments which you made, you did not go along there and let your water get down below the crown-sheet, did you?

A. No, sir; I just done it; just jogging along there, just to see what I could do and how far I could run it, when I thought it was safe to put the water back in the boiler, I wasn't going to let it run to an unsafe point.

Q. How long did it run you under the experiment you made, in minutes?

A. I didn't experiment in minutes. I kept my eye on that water, I was looking at the water.

Q. How long did it run you in miles?

A. Two or two and a half miles, somewhere along that neighborhood, I just went along there and everything was working nice and smooth and it just popped into my mind, I will just give you a trial, and I just shut the injector off and said nothing to any body and went on. The fireman looked around at me, and I would look around like that, and I wouldn't say anything to anybody, I have said more here than anywhere else about it.

Q. If the left injector was put on by the engineer, do you think the fireman would know it or not?

A. I tell you from my standpoint, the way I handle them, it depends, there is one or two things, if I have got a new fireman that knows nothing about the injector, I don't say anything to him, I step over there and tell him to step out of the way.

Q. He knows what you are doing?

A. You mean do all firemen know?

Q. Yes, anybody would.

A. Yes, sir; he knows when I put that left injector on.

Q. He is bound to?

A. He looks at you first and then the injector, and then the steam guage.

Q. You don't think it is possible for an engineer to put on the left injector without the fireman knowing it?

A. I cannot say about that, it depends how the fireman is situated in the cab.

Q. You cannot hardly see how he could?

A. He might be up on his knees or on the gangway and I can walk over there and test it like that and he know nothing about it.

Q. But if the fireman is in his place, do you think it is possible to do that?

A. He would have to get his feet out of the way because
[442] the water valve is right there; he sits here (indicating), the water valve is there (indicating), and you have got to move something to get to the water valve.

Q. And the fireman has got to move?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. With the brakeman sitting with the fireman, both on the same seat, do you think it is a physical possibility for the engineer to put on that left injector without the fireman knowing something about it?

A. I don't see how it would if he had his mind on his business at all.

Q. Are these injectors anyways complicated or can any engineer work them?

A. Any engineer can work them that calls himself an engineman.

Q. A man who could not work his injector would hardly hold his job on the railroad?

A. He wouldn't not only hold his job but he wouldn't get out of the yard if he couldn't work the injector.

Q. If he couldn't work the injector he couldn't get out of the yard?

A. No, sir.

Q. I believe you told us you relied on the water glass if everything was going along smoothly and nice, you looked at the water glass, and if the water glass got sluggish and showed any dropping down, you begin to test your chuck?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the ordinary custom and practice among

[443] engineers?

A. Yes, sir; I might say, every hour or two, it is the practice, it is at least with me.

Q. Mr. Hall asked you how hard it was to keep water in the engine at this point. Is it any harder to keep the water in the engine at this point than it is at any other point along the road on the same grade?

A. That depends how you are working your engine.

Q. Let's assume your engine and everything is going nice, is it hard to keep water in there at all?

A. If the engine is working nice and properly, everything working smoothly along there, it is not hard.

Q. There is nothing difficult at all about it?

A. It is not hard to keep water along there with one of these Sellers' injectors.

Q. It is not any harder there than any other point along the road, is it?

A. No, sir; I do not believe it is, unless you hog your engine. I can hog an engine through that dip and knock the water out of it in a little bit.

Q. What is that?

A. Dropping in the corner and widening on them and make them growl a little bit louder, that is changing the stroke of your engine, what I call work the back pressure,; that is, if you do not throttle here right, dropping your reverse lever down, and giving her more steam, that is what I call it.

[444] Q. That is not fair to the engine to hog her?

A. No, sir; not exactly fair to hog her.

Q. In the first place, how many time will your tank fill your boiler?

A. You done got way up yonder now, I think there is 12,000 gallons of water in one of the tanks and 15,000 in the boiler.

Q. 15,000 in the boiler?

A. 1500, I should have said.

Q. Isn't it true your tank fills your boiler twice?

A. No; if mine did not fill it any more than that I wouldn't have any water at all; I don't know how much water it takes to fill one of them boilers.

Q. The boiler I have been informed holds something about four or five thousand gallons all told, is that about right?

A. I don't know, I never measured the water in it.

Q. If it is true that the tank will fill the boiler only about two or three times and you could consume a boiler of water in a two-mile run, they would have these tanks along the track about every five or six miles, wouldn't they?

A. If you consumed all the water you may say, from out the front end, all along among the flues and off the crown-sheet, you would have to have 85 empties to haul the water before you could get from one side of the track to the other.

[445] Q. If you can practically consume the water in your boiler over the crown-sheet in a couple of miles you sure would have to have your tanks along up the road a heap closer than they are now, wouldn't you?

A. To use it all off the crown-sheet?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I never used it all off, I don't know how much you got to go below that bottom guage cock, I presume that is about the larger part of the crown-sheet from the guage cock down, because it comes up like that (indicating).

Q. If that was true, if you could consume practically the water over the crown-sheet in two miles, how close do you figure they would have to have the tanks along the right-of-way?

A. If I consumed the water over the crown-sheet—I never consumed no water over that crown-sheet—you want me to have a burned engine here shortly.

Q. Do all engines of that class consume the same amount of water?

A. No, sir; some engines will use more water than others.

Re-Examination.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. If the fireman and the brakeman were both on the left side and the engineer wanted to put on his left injector, would he have to get one out of the way?

A. That depends how they were sitting. If the fireman were sitting down—say, there is the seat box and he was sitting like this and the front brakeman was sitting like this (indicating), here is some room, here is the water valve, and if that fireman was sitting like that he has got to move his seat, if he is like that, with [446] his head out of the window that way (indicating), I could go to that injector and put it on and he never notice it. If he is standing in the gangway like that (indicating), I could get to that injector and put it on if he is an inexperienced man, but if he

is an experienced man and knows his business it is pretty hard to do it.

Q. If he had his feet on the box with his head hanging out of the window, you can put it on and he not know it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where does the front brakeman ride?

A. He generally always rides in front of the fireman on the front seat box, with his feet like that.

Q. He doesn't stay on the engineer's side, does he?

A. There is no room over there for him.

Q. Now, which do you rely on to determine the water in your boiler, the water glass or the guage cocks?

A. I rely on my guage cocks.

Q. Why?

A. It is the more safe plan to tell when you have got water. I can take a water glass at night, I have run engines with the light out, and you could not see the water glass, but I can tell by the sound whether I am getting water in it.

Q. You can open that and tell always?

[447] A. That is the most up-to-date mechanical idea ever I seen to tell water.

Q. If you are running at night and you haven't got a light in your engine, is it easy to see whether you have got water in your water glass or not?

A. If you have got no light you cannot see it.

Q. Suppose you don't have a good light there?

A. A good light, it don't take a very good light there for the water glass, the water glass ain't more than that long (indicating). It depends how you got the light on the glass or in the cab whether it is going to do you any good or not, if you have got it turned around like that where it don't reflect on the water glass, it is no good, but if you have got it reflecting on the water glass, it will make light enough to see water in the glass.

Q. Which way does this water guage face, the flat side of it, where you look in and see whether there is water in it or not?

A. The way that they face on them engines over there is, take an engineman, he is sitting about in this position (indicating), as lazy as you can get him in; that flat part of the water glass is facing him like that (indicating), and all he has got to do is to throw his head that way and look at it like that (indicating).

Q. When it is set that way, does it face the fireman, when he is firing?

A. No, sir; he is back here firing (indicating), the
[448] water glass sets like that, and here is your door and here is your engineer, he has got that water glass facing him, and the fireman is down here (indicating).

Q. And you can only see the water in that glass by looking at the flat side, can you?

A. That is the only way I could see it.

Q. And is that the side that faces the engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would look at that and see if that is the kind of water glass that is on those engines?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Hold that up and show the jury how it faces the engineer.

A. Take it this way (indicating), say we are going west, that water glass sets back on that side of them big boilers, this is my seat right here and this sets on the boiler just in that shape, you can turn it just a little bit, an engineer generally has it turned so he can see like that, and he looks out of the window that way and if this water glass is turned too far back that way, it will be shaded, if it is turned a little too much towards the boiler, you have got to lean over this way to see it.

Q. If it happened to be turned so that the fireman could watch it every time he fired, would the engineer be able to see it without turning his head or changing his position?

A. No, sir; he would have to be sitting kinder in this
[449] shape, this way (indicating), the fireman is down here. If he is going to look at it this way, he would have to be sitting more this way, more out towards the cab of the window.

Q. If it was setting so that the fireman could look at it every time he threw coal into the fire box, what position would the engineer have to get in, in order to see it?

A. Back like this (indicating).

Q. He would have to raise all the way up as you have indicated and look back?

A. Yes, sir; I always keep it like this (indicating), so I don't have to turn round.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. What is that you told us about a little experiment and about what your fireman did?

A. That was a little stunt I pulled off about Singer tank.

Q. What did your fireman do?

A. He would throw a little coal like that and look at me; he didn't look at the glass that way.

Q. How did he do?

A. Here is his position(indicating). The fireman was in this position, say this was the boiler and there is the water glass, and here is the engineer on this side, the water glass facing the [450] engineer, there is your fire door, and he was throwing coal like that.

Q. Just show what the fireman did.

A. He did just like that (indicating).

Q. Is that the way he looked?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. There was no trouble in seeing it if he does that?

A. He has got to turn around that way and see it.

Q. It is not the intention of the railroad company to hide the water glass from the fireman, is it?

A. No, sir.

Q. There is no trouble about their seeing?

A. No, sir; and mighty near all of them watch it, too, don't you forget it.

Q. You don't know how the water glass was setting on this particular engine?

A. No, sir; not on 469.

(Witness stands aside.)

[451] A. G. HOUSTON.

A. G. Houston, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. What position do you hold with the Virginian Railway Company and what position did you hold in November, 1912?

A. Railroad foreman of engines.

Q. And you still hold that position?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long had you been acting in that capacity at that time?

A. About a year and four months.

Q. What experience did you have as to the use and construc-

tion of engines previous to your becoming road foreman of engines?

A. I started working in the roundhouse in the fall of 1898, and went from there on to the road firing and fired about six years in all, and then after firing I was running up to the time I was promoted to road foreman.

Q. What year did you begin firing?

A. 1899.

Q. And you were an engineer when?

A. 1903.

Q. Did you go to the point of the accident for the purpose of taking this engine to Princeton?

A. Yes, sir; not to the point of accident, but to Fagg.

Q. Did you take charge of the engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you carry it on to Princeton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the engine preserved in the same condition in [452] which it was when it was turned over to you at Fagg?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do with the engine when you got to Princeton?

A. I left it in charge of workmen there, who were putting canvas over the entrance to keep anybody from getting in there.

Q. Did you see that done?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the engine remain in that same condition until the Interstate Commerce Inspectors came to look at it?

A. The next morning they took the canvas off and boarded it up.

Q. Did the engine itself remain in the same condition until it was examined by the Interstate Commerce Inspectors?

A. I think it did; I did not stay right there all the time, but as far as I know, there was nothing removed from it or anything done to it at all.

Q. Did you examine the injectors on this engine when you took charge of it?

A. No, sir; not particularly so.

Q. Did you examine them later?

A. I did when the Inspectors were there and we were testing them on another engine.

Q. What was the condition of the injectors at that time?

[453] A. Good.

Q. Is one injector ordinarily sufficient to keep enough water in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under what circumstances does an engineer use two injectors?

A. When the water gets low he generally puts the other one on to regain it a little.

Q. Does your experience in running over the line between Singer and the point of accident and between Roanoke and the point of accident enable you to state about how fast an engine of this class, No. 469, will use water out of the boiler?

A. They would use from Roanoke to the point of the accident ordinarily—

Q. (Interposing.) I mean how rapidly will it use water out of the boiler. I mean by that can you tell how long it would take if you had a boiler with enough water in it to show within an inch of the top of the guage, how long it would take you under ordinary conditions, not putting any more water in the boiler, to work that water out of the engine so that the crown-sheet would be exposed?

A. You would probably go about a mile, between a mile and a mile and a half.

[454] Q. Have you had sufficient experience in running engines over that portion of the road to enable you to tell about that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What experience have you had in connection with handling engines other than what you have already told us?

A. When these engines came here they were all new, and that was part of my duty to ride them and get them working properly and I expect I averaged two trips a week down to Roanoke and back.

Q. And on these trips did you examine the performance of the engines with reference to their—

Q. On these trips that you were making back and forth on these particular engines, did you, or not, observe their performance with respect to the amount of water they consumed among other things?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you run the engines yourself?

[455] A. Part of the time I did.

Objection overruled. Plaintiff excepted.

Q. Does the operation of these injectors depend to any extent

upon the manner in which they are put on?

A. Somewhat, yes, sir.

Q. If the injector is not put on properly, will it carry water into the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. What is the practice of engineers as to the inspection of their crown-sheets when they start out on their runs?

A. I have noticed most of them that about the first thing they do when they get on the engine after being called is to look at the crown-sheet.

Q. Can he tell anything about his crown-sheet by looking at it in that way?

A. Yes, sir; he can tell whether it is leaking or not.

Q. Can he see the sheet itself?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you require them to do that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you examine the boiler of this engine after it was taken to Princeton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you find?

[456] A. I found that the crown-sheet was bagged down up towards the front end and that the grates, most of them were blown down into the ash pan.

Q. Did you examine the inside of the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. You simply examined the outside of the boiler?

A. Inside the fire box.

Q. What was the color of the iron of the crown-sheet?

A. I did not pay any particular attention to that at all, I was not called in as an inspector, I was just simply there to—

Q. (Interposing.) What was the condition of the water glass on engine 469?

A. It showed all right when we tested it on other engines.

Q. And the water guages?

A. They were all right.

Q. In the operation of an engine, is it safe to rely entirely on the water glass to indicate the level of your water in the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. What is the most accurate instrument there for measuring the quantity of water in the boiler?

A. The guage cocks.

Q. Why not the water glass?

A. It is apt to get stopped up and show a false level.

Q. If the water glass should happen to get stopped up,
[457] is there any means provided by which an engineer can open it up on the trip?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is that?

A. There is a little blow-off cock underneath the water glass.

Q. Who has charge of that water glass while the engine is being run?

A. The engineer.

Q. Does anybody else have charge of it?

A. No, sir.

Q. And I believe you stated there are means at hand for his clearing it out if it should get stopped up?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can he tell when it gets stopped up?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. How much water ought to be used out of that tank from Roanoke to the point of this accident?

A. About 6000 gallons.

Q. What is the capacity of the tank?

A. 12,000.

[458] Q. In other words, you think about one-half of the tank ought to have been used up from Roanoke to the point of the accident if it had been full when it left Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is in accordance with your usual experience, is it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you measure the water in the tank when you got it to Princeton?

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Do you know what it showed?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see it measured?

A. No, sir; I do not think I did.

Q. What damage was done to the inside of the engine
[459] there as to the wagon top?

A. There was none done to the wagon top.

Q. No damage at all done to that part up there?

A. No, sir.

Q. It didn't look like any violent burst, did it?

A. Only down at the crown-sheet.

Q. You say that you ran an engine with the water about an inch from the top of the water glass and used it up in about a mile?

A. Something like that, I think that would be about right, perhaps it might go a little further, and in some cases a little less.

Q. Do you know anything about the capacity of that boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. You are not familiar with that?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know the number of gallons it holds?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know the capacity of the injector, do you?

A. About—their maximum capacity is about 7000 gallons an hour.

Q. 7000 gallons an hour?

A. I think so.

Q. Is that one injector or both?

A. One.

[460] Q. What condition were the grate bars in?

A. Some of them were down in the ash pan, clean down into the bottom of the ash pan, and some of them, one of them, was laying on the outside of the rest, and some of them were broken down, part way.

Q. What kind of condition was the stoker hole in?

A. The caps were blown off of them.

Q. Of all of them?

A. I think so, but I am not sure about that.

(Witness stands aside.)

[461] E. C. GRISSOM.

E. C. Grissom, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Were do you live?

A. Princeton.

Q. What do you do?

A. I run a garage.

Q. Were you ever employed at Princeton by the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity?

A. As a machinist.

Q. Were you working for the Virginian at the time this engine 409 was blown up?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any inspection or any examination of the parts of that engine after it was brought into the shop at Princeton?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What parts of it did you examine?

A. I tested the steam guage in the presence of the Interstate Commerce Inspectors; I tested the cocks, both high and low pressure; I tested both injectors at intervals during the time the steam was coming up. I taken the injectors off and handed them to the Interstate Commerce Inspectors, the water columns, both valves, top and bottom.

[462] Q. How did the injectors and the steam guage and the water cocks that you tested show up?

A. They tested all right, the injectors picked up a part of the water valves at sixty pounds, a little more at one hundred pounds, and filled the water valves at 180.

Q. How did the steam guage test?

A. Right to the very ounce, 185 pounds, it tested up to 250 pounds right to the line, 20 pounds at a time after 15 pounds.

Q. Did you see the Interstate Inspectors test the water glass and the water cocks?

A. They blowed through them when I took them off and handed them to them.

Q. How did they test?

A. All right, they said, and they sounded to me like they were all right, too.

No cross-examination.

(Witness stands aside.)

[463] C. L. RICHARDSON, RECALLED.

C. L. Richardson, recalled, for defendant:

Further cross-examination by Mr. Hunt:

Q. I want to ask you one question which I forgot to ask you while you were on the witness stand. Mr. Richardson, is it possible for an engineer to go up to his engine with a fire in it sufficient to run it, and inspect the crown-sheet, and determine whether that crown-sheet has ever been scorched previously? Is that possible?

A. You want me to answer this question in regards to the experience I have had in running locomotives and inspecting crown-sheets?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I can not.

Q. You can not do it?

A. I can not; I have looked in these things and I cannot tell when they are burned; but I can tell if they are leaking, but I cannot tell when they are burned.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Can you tell whether they are leaking?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose a crown-sheet was bagged down, pocketed down between the stay-bolts, you could tell that, couldn't you?

A. I never seen one pocketed.

[464] Q. You have seen that one, haven't you (indicating crown-sheet in the court room)?

A. Yes, sir; but I have never seen one in a locomotive that was alive, pocketed.

Q. You never did?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why didn't you?

A. I never did find one.

Q. Have you looked to see if you could see them?

A. Yes, sir; I have gone to a chain gang engine and I have put the blower on and found anywhere from two to three to four crown-bolts leaking, and then I make my report of it to the road foreman of engines, or to the roundhouse foreman, and I say, engine so and so has got three or four crown-bolts leaking, don't forget, I did not burn that engine.

Q. That engine wasn't pocketed?

A. I couldn't tell you.

Q. If the crown-sheet was pocketed as bad as that one is, could you look in the fire box and see if it was pocketed?

A. If it was bagged down like that I would begin to run.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. If it was pocketed like it is in this corner could you tell it where it is not blown down?

A. I have never looked at that thing right good.

[465] Q. Step over to that corner and look at it; I mean this corner, not where it is bagged down. Those little pockets here, could you look in the fire box with a hot fire in it and see those?

A. If that crown-sheet was like this one, I cannot do it, I never have found one.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You could find the leak all right?

A. Yes, sir; in the dark, mighty near.

Q. When they are scorched or burned they will leak, when you cannot find any pockets?

A. The ones I have seen in my experience in railroading that was burned, they claimed was burned, I have had them with three or four crown-bolts leaking in them, and thirty-five or forty, and you just hear them say that engine has been scorched, but I never saw any pockets in them, but I could see that water flowing out of there.

Q. When you have got a steam pressure of 185 pounds on it, does that force the water out of it so you can see it without trouble?

A. The experience I have had in regard to burned crown-sheets, if you get on an engine when the steam pressure is low on it, the leaks will show up worse in the crown-sheet, and if the crown-sheet is cooled to a certain extent, just as soon as you put a hot fire in that engine and it is popping off, that iron will expand and stop them leaks to a certain extent, that is the experience I have had in my

[466] eleven years experience with burned crown-sheets.

Q. But you can still see it leaking up there?

A. I have seen thirty-five or forty crown-bolts in a boiler leaking with 135 pounds of steam pressure on, and just as soon as you get that engine around to the maximum pressure of 150 or 160 or 180 and get that fire box good and hot, they will all dry up, but one or two sometimes.

(Witness stands aside.)

[467] R. H. SCOTT, RECALLED.

R. H. Scott, recalled, for defendant:

Further cross-examination by Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Scott, when that accident happened and the train stopped, what did you do then?

A. I went over to where I found the men.

Q. How long do you reckon it was after the engine blowed down before the train stopped, how long did it drift?

A. Not over a couple of minutes, a minute probably; but I don't know what time the engine blowed down.

Q. Then you walked up the track until you came to where Jerre Walton was?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He was the first one you came to from the cab, wasn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then how far was it beyond him that you came to the engineer, Mr. Andrews?

A. Four or five cars.

Q. What did you do after you talked to Mr. Walton and administered to the men awhile, then you went back to the cab, didn't you?

A. I went back to the cab and got my bed clothing and took them over there and covered them up the best I could.

Q. How long do you reckon it was from the time the accident happened until Mr. Thomas got there? About an hour, do you reckon?

A. I guess it was, for I had to walk two miles.

[468] Q. And telegraph?

A. Yes, sir; telephone.

Q. And then he had to come there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It must have been at least an hour, wasn't it?

A. I suppose it was; the very best that could have been done.

Q. Which was the furthest west, Mr. Andrews or the brakeman?

A. I couldn't say, because they were pretty close together, one on one side of the train and one on the other.

Q. Just about even, weren't they?

A. About even; yes, sir.

Q. And the brakeman was on the opposite side of the train from where he had been sitting, according to Mr. Walton, when the crown-sheet failed, he was on the right side, wasn't he, when you found him?

A. Mr. Walton said he was sitting on his side of the engine, which would be the left side.

Q. And you found him on the right side?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the engineer was supposed to be sitting on the right side and you found him on the left side?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[469] S. H. LEWIS.

S. H. Lewis, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What is your profession?

A. I have been railroading for about 25 years, following the mechanical department end of it.

Q. What position have you held in connection with the mechanical department?

A. I have been a machinist and foreman, master mechanic and assistant superintendent of motive power.

Q. Were you educated as a mechanical engineer?

A. Not entirely; no, sir. I did not finish the course as a mechanical engineer.

Q. Did you serve your apprenticeship as a machinist?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then you were a master mechanic?

A. I was a foreman first and then master mechanic and assistant superintendent of motive power, the last position I held.

Q. What kind of work are you doing now?

A. Railway supply business.

Q. You are not employed by any railroad now, are you?

A. No, sir.

Q. What railroads have you worked for?

A. I suppose about twelve or thirteen.

Q. Mention some of them, mention the principal railroads.

A. The C. & O, the Seabord Air Line, Virginian Railway, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, Sante Fe, Mexican Central, Kansas City, Pittsburgh and Gulf.

Q. What railroad were you working for when you were [470] foreman?

A. I was with the Seaboard as foreman, when I left there I went to the Virginian as master mechanic.

Q. How long did you serve as master mechanic for the Virginian?

A. Four years.

Q. How long did you serve as assistant superintendent of motive power for the Virginian?

A. Two years.

Q. When did you quit working for the Virginian?

A. The first of May, 1913.

Q. Now, in your experience in those various positions, did you become familiar with boilers and burned crown-sheets and things of that kind?

A. Yes, sir; I had some experience along that line. We had several engines burned while I was with the Virginian Railroad; the first one on there was on the East End, No. 302; that pocketed, but not as large as that, but it had quite a large pocket.

Q. Did it explode and blow down?

A. It blew down; it pocketed, I suppose, about two feet long.

Q. Did you have an opportunity of observing burned or scorched crown-sheets while you were with the Seaboard and these other railroads you have mentioned?

[471] A. I don't know as I saw so many with the other railroads as I did with the Virginian; there was more engines burned on the Virginian while I was there than on any other railroad; I cannot say that more burned there, but I saw more.

Q. Were you more directly in charge of that class of work at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you tell when a crown-sheet is burned?

A. It can be burned in different ways; sometimes they get scorched a little without pocketing, the crown-sheet bolts will leak, that is, in the highest part of the crown-sheet, the part that becomes exposed first, and as a general thing the flue-sheet will open up where it has been corked against the crown-sheet right at the highest point, that is one of the best indications, I believe, to show that the water has been off the sheet.

Q. If the sheet is burned to the extent this one is, and one witness has said from three and a quarter to three and a half feet wide and four and a half feet long over that space, and there is pocketing between each one of the stay-bolts, how would you tell that sheet was burned if the engine was in service and had steam pressure on it?

A. According to my experience the bolts would have leaked so bad that you would have told when the engine came in, if she had been on the road, and it sometimes, as I said, leaks without pocketing.

Q. But when they pocket they always leak. Can a crown-
[472] sheet be burned with water on top of it?

A. It could if the water was kept a sufficient distance away from it, but if the water was in contact with the sheet it would not.

Q. Did you inspect this sheet after the failure?

A. I went into the fire box at the time the Government inspectors came there to inspect it.

Q. What were the indications then on the sheet that it had been burned?

A. The shape of it, being blown down, would indicate that the water was off it and that the pressure was on top and that after the sheet got hot and soft there was impressions of the bolt heads in the sheet, showing that the sheet must have been forced down pretty hard on those bolt heads before the heads came off, making an impression in the sheet; there was pocketing between the bolts, and I believe I mentioned the color of the sheet would indicate it.

Q. How about the shape of the bolt heads that you found in the fire box, what did they indicate?

A. The first bolt-head I picked up was on the flare of the ash pan; before I got on the engine I saw one laying in the extension of the ash pan side, it was of a blue color, same as the color of the sheet, and it had been burned back down, rolled down on the face of it, that goes up against the sheet, cuts over.

Q. Could the bolt-head have been put in that shape and
[473] could those marks have been made, under that bolt head, the indentations on the crown-sheet, when it was cold?

A. It would have had to have had awful pressure, I suppose, if it had been hit a hammer blow or something like that, it would have left an impression.

Q. My question means this, under 185 pounds of pressure to the square inch, would it be possible to force those bolt-heads in the shape that they are in when they are cold, that is, with water on the top of the sheet?

A. No, sir; I was going to say if that could be done it would go on every day, because you have got that condition with water on top of the crown-sheet and with 185 pounds of steam, and you do not find the heads are being burned over.

Q. Does it increase the pressure any on the bolt-heads for an

explosion of that kind to occur?

A. Does it increase the pressure on the bolt-heads?

Q. Yes, sir; does it make the pressure any greater?

A. No; the pressure is no greater at the time the explosion occurs, that is, if it is due to the sheet becoming hot; there might be other causes that would increase the pressure if the safety valves are not right.

Q. What I mean is this: Suppose you have a crown-sheet with water on top of it, and the bolt-heads in their normal shape, and for some cause or other the bolt-heads give way and they drop off and fall down, under those conditions, with water on top of it, would [474] that pressure of 185 pounds be sufficient in the explosion or falling down of the sheet to force the bolt-heads in the shape that these are in?

A. I do not understand that question. You said if the bolt-heads had dropped off?

Q. If they are forced off or broken off.

A. I wish you would repeat that question, I do not think I understand it.

Q. The question I want to ask this witness is this, whether or not these bolt-heads, shaped as they are, with a square [475] surface on the top side of them, could be forced in that shape cold, that is, with water on the top of the crown-sheet at the time the sheet went down?

A. That head would not come off under that condition at all.

Q. Just suppose for the sake of argument that it could come off, under that condition, could it, for the sake of the question, and assume what Professor Randolph said, as we understood him to be correct, that it could come off, could it force the bolt-head in that shape?

A. Not in my opinion, I do not think it would ever bend that bolt over cold like that(it might burr up the edge around, but not bend the bolts as it is there.

Q. You mentioned certain indentations or marks on the crown-sheet around the holes, showing that the bolt-heads had been forced into the crown-sheet, could those impressions on the crown-[476] sheet have been made when the crown-sheet had water on top of it?

A. That is, the sheet cold?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Not with an evenly exerted pressure it wouldn't, just forced down.

Q. Could it have been done under any conditions with 185 pounds pressure on it when it was cold?

A. No, sir.

Q. Some question has been asked here about the amount of water that was in that tank, do you know how much water was in the tank when the tank arrived at Princeton?

A. We did not measure it when it came in, we measured it later. The engine was brought in and put on the side track with the tank coupled up to it, and the following day the Government inspectors came and we measured the water in the tank in their presence, and it was twenty-nine inches.

Q. Do you know how many gallons of water that was?

A. It was a 12,000 tank, and I imagine it is five feet in depth—no, I wouldn't say how much it was without figuring it up, because the tank was an irregular shape. I don't know just how many gallons that would be.

Q. What was the date of that inspection that the Interstate Commerce inspectors made?

A. I couldn't say; I have not a record of it.

[477] Q. Was it just a few days after the accident?

A. I was away from Princeton the night or at the time the engine was brought in. I got back the following day and I think the Interstate inspector came in that same day, and it was in the afternoon that we got into the fire box.

Q. When you made that inspection that day in the presence of the Interstate Commerce inspectors, or when they made the inspection, did you see the injectors tested?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did they work?

A. They worked very well. We put them on another engine of the same class just coming out of the shop, No. 468, I think was the number, and after he got steam on that engine we tried these injectors, that is, we exchanged injectors off the 468 and put the 469 injectors on that engine, and when she got up steam we worked it at various steam pressures. I have forgotten just how they run, but I think it was 100 pounds we tried them first, and up to the maximum, 185, and they worked perfectly.

Q. What condition was the water glass found in?

A. The water glass was found to be in good condition and the valves were open; you could blow through them; we took the glass off and the pipe off and blowed through them.

Q. How about the water cocks?

A. The guage cocks, they were not stopped up.

Q. Did you examine the stay-bolts that were left in the engine?

A. I wasn't inside the boiler; I saw them from the fire
[478] box through these holes in the crown-sheet.

Q. Where were they broken?

A. They were broken right under the head of that bolt and left hanging to the shell of the boiler.

Q. Were any of them broken anywhere else except right under the head of the bolt?

A. I didn't see any that were broken any other place. I cannot say I saw them all; I saw a large number of them just looking up through the holes, they were hanging down; but I never did get inside the boiler.

Q. Now, you spoke of the color of this crown-sheet indicating at that time that it had been burned. What color was it?

A. It was a bluish color.

Q. And what was the color of the bolt-heads and bolts on the ends of them?

A. They were the same color. These bolt-heads are the bolt-heads that came off these bolts and we found on the surface they were an iron color, and when they came up they were blue, the same as the sheet, which we took came from heat; they were heated and burned that color.

Q. Was there any line of demarcation showing to what extent the sheet had been burned there?

A. Yes, sir; you could see the color line.

Q. Was it distinct?

A. Very distinct; yes, sir.

Q. Was it more distinct than it is now?

[479] A. I think it was; it seems to be faded a little.

Q. Why is that?

A. Why is what?

Q. Why was it more distinct then than now?

A. I don't know just what chemical action has taken place; there is rust there, I imagine, to some extent. If it had been put in a damp place the color would have been obliterated before this.

Q. To what extent did that sheet have to be handled in order to get it out of the engine?

A. They had to cut some of the rivets off from the front of the flue-sheet around the flange and probably on the side back, there, a few bolts had to be cut off, that were not broken, and then it had to be chipped out of the fire box.

Q. You mean you had to cut it out with a chisel, that section of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In doing that and the men working over it or around it, would that have any effect on the color line and obliterating them, or help to?

A. No, sir; that wouldn't necessarily do so; they wouldn't necessarily have come in contact with the sheet on the bottom side, that is, on the fire side.

Q. Were they doing that from the top?

A. They cut it, I think, from the fire side, from the appearance of it.

[480] Q. Would the handling of the sheet, the shipping it around and handling it around in that shape, would that have any effect on the color line?

A. As soon as that sheet was removed from the boiler I had it taken up to the second floor of the office building and wrapped it up in heavy wrapping paper and tied it up so as to keep it as near its natural condition at that time as possible.

Q. The sheet was handled and shipped down to Roanoke in February of this year, wasn't it?

A. I saw it in the court room down there; yes, sir.

Q. Did you measure the surface of that sheet that showed that it had been burned by having pockets between the bolt holes?

A. How do you mean?

Q. Did you measure the surface of the sheet that indicated that it had been burned by pockets being between the bolt holes?

A. No, sir ;I didn't measure it.

Q. You know how large a surface it is, you have looked at it to see that?

A. About, yes, sir; approximately.

Q. Could a crown-sheet be burned over that area and pocketed between the bolts to the extent that one is without leaking?

A. Not according to my experience. As I say, they will leak sometimes without pocketing; where the water gets off you will find the bolts will leak without the pockets.

[481] Q. What shape is that sheet in when it is in the engine?

A. It is a little arched; it is not flat and level, it is high at the front end and sloped towards the back end.

Q. Is it buckled down like it is now in the middle?

A. No, sir; it is the reverse of that.

Q. It is arched up a little the other way, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far down had it been forced from its true position, would you say?

A. Ten and three-quarter inches is what was measured there in the fire box while I was in it, is my recollection, that is what it was taken at. We had one of these folding rules and put it up there through the holes and measured down, that was measured by Mr. Slayton and the Government inspector, Mr. Williams, the Interstate Commerce Commission inspector.

Q. What effect would the forcing of the sheet down in its present position have on the pocketing between the bolt holes?

A. It would relieve them to a certain extent, that is, the pockets wouldn't be as deep as they were at one time before it blew down, before the bolt-heads gave way.

Q. How would that relieve it?

A. Stretching the material there would have a tendency to pull out or straighten them out.

Q. If the sheet was cold when it was forced down, that is,
[482] I mean, not overheated, with water on top of it, would it pull the pockets out then?

A. If it was forced down cold with the bolts in there?

Q. Yes, sir; with the bolts broken off under the head, as they were?

A. I do not think it would pocket, that is, if the bolts weren't there, there would be nothing to pocket, to force down in between the bolts, that is what caused the pocket.

Q. Did you ever seen the heads pulled off any of these button-head bolts like these are, under a crown-sheet, with water on top of it?

A. No, I never saw it.

Q. Did you ever see any crown-sheet bolts break off under the head that way with water on the sheet?

A. I never heard of one coming off with water on the sheet.

Q. Where is this bolt stronger, around the head or in the body of the bolt?

A. The body would be the weakest part.

Q. The body would be the weakest part?

A. Yes, sir; and it would break first if subjected to a pull.

Q. Have you ever tried a crown-sheet or a crown-head bolt to determine where it will break first?

[483] A. I have not personally; no, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. How about if the head happens to be broke, the body wouldn't break first, would it?

A. No, sir.

Q. I mean if the head was cracked up in that thread?

A. No, sir; the body around closest to the head.

Q. I mean cracked up between the head and crown-sheet?

A. It would be weakened by being cracked that way.

Q. It would make that weaker than the body of the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it or not true that the sudden letting go of a few bolts throws such an additional load on the adjacent ones that they are frequently unable to stand the strain and tear out row by row until the whole crown-sheet is blown down? Do you, or not, recognize that as being true of what happens to bolts when they are in boilers under those conditions?

A. You would have to have a great many bolts broken to do that; you could have a few bolts or quite a number broken without even the sheet pocketing.

Q. I am talking about if they were adjacent to each other.

A. I know, you might have quite a number broken and the sheet wouldn't even break at the ordinary boiler pressure.

[484] Q. Suppose a whole lot of the bolts had been injured by having low water before that, six or ten hours maybe before, wouldn't that weakness there make them give way quicker?

A. If the bolts were injured by being burned?

Q. Injured by heat or any way, say oil or scale or low water, or any way, I don't care how.

A. I was just figuring how these bolts were going to be injured without injuring the sheet or without showing.

Q. I didn't ask you that.

A. I cannot answer your question.

Q. I assume that as a fact, whether you think that would be a fact or not, I am not asking you that, but I am asking you that as a fact.

A. That if a few bolts were broken, it would do what, it would allow the sheet to blow down, is that what you mean?

Q. I will ask you the question again. Is it or not true that the sudden letting go of a few bolts throws such an additional load on the adjacent ones that they are frequently unable to stand the strain

and tear out row by row until the whole crown-sheet is blown down. Is that a fact or not?

A. I cannot say; I never saw that condition; I never saw that done.

Q. Don't you believe that when some of the bolts let go that it throws an additional strain on the other bolts?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if it does that it might distort other bolts, might it not, if the strain was increased sufficiently?

A. There would be more strain thrown on the other bolts.

[485] Q. And when it starts to go down you have got the momentum of the sheet started in motion?

A. It does not gain much momentum.

Q. The slightest motion when things are held tight, means a whole lot?

A. No, sir; I do not think so, it would have to go some distance before the momentum would amount to anything.

Q. I am talking about after some have already broken and the sheet has started its momentum, wouldn't that starting motion combined with the increased strain on the bolts, start them down?

A. I don't know that it would; of course if the bolts or bolt heads or so many were broken and the balance were overheated, they would give way if the pressure is sufficient.

Q. That is what I mean, the increased strain on the balance of those bolts on account of some of them giving way.

A. It would probably pull other bolts.

Q. And twist that out of shape, wouldn't it?

A. It would probably pull them in two.

Q. It would be bound to do it, wouldn't it?

A. Under certain conditions it would, that is, if the strain was great enough to, they would pull in two.

Q. That is what I mean. You say you are now in the railway supply business?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you mean by that?

[486] A. Selling supplies or trying to sell supplies.

Q. To railroads?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever try to sell any to the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir; I have made several attempts to sell some to the Virginian.

Q. You have had a little success, haven't you, I reckon?

A. Not a great deal.

Q. You haven't sold them anything at all?

A. Yes, sir; I have sold them a little bilt, but not any to amount to anything.

Q. How hot do you think that crown-sheet would have to be to go down from low water?

A. I think it would be above a cherry red.

Q. It would have to be about a white heat, wouldn't it?

A. I don't know that it would be exactly at white heat, it would be between a cherry red and a white heat.

Q. If that crown-sheet had gotten that hot, and in that malleable condition, would that take all the life out of the iron?

A. No, sir.

Q. Would it stretch in that condition?

A. No, sir.

Q. I mean if iron is stretched in a hot condition like [487] that.

A. That is flanged steel and it will stand a great deal of heating and bending.

Q. What kind of steel?

A. Flange steel, fire box steel.

Q. I am talking about the iron in the bolts.

A. I thought you were referring to the iron in the sheet.

Q. I mean the bolts, if they got hot, wouldn't that take the life out of them and make them lifeless?

A. No, not unless they were heated up high enough to burn them, that wouldn't be high enough, white heat is welding heat and they often heat them to that.

Q. Is that your opinion that it will not, in that condition?

A. I say frequently they heat iron to a white heat for welding and it does not injure them at all.

Q. I never asked you would they do that or not.

A. You asked me if a white heat wouldn't injure the bolts.

Q. I said if they pulled and stretched in that condition.

A. It would rupture the bolts.

Q. Wouldn't it injure the quality of the metal?

A. No, I do not think it would injure the quality of the metal. Of course, the metal while it was hot would be softer and it would not have the strength it had before, up to that heat, it would not.

Q. The hottest part of these bolt heads would be the part [488] nearest the fire, wouldn't it?

A. Where the fire struck the bolt heads would be the hottest part.

Q. The bottom part ought to be hotter than the head then, if the bolt was on the crown-sheet at the time it was heated?

A. The heat was there then and it would probably heat at the same time.

Q. If that would start to go down the first thing that would fall would be the bolt head?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It would be bound to be heated in there then in a fraction of a second in a hot fire like that?

A. If they dropped into the fire, you mean?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. They would be heated.

Q. There is no question about that, is there? They would be bound to be?

A. I do not think there was very much fire left in that ash pan in this particular case; it seemed to have been blown out.

Q. Isn't it true that the tensile strength of the crown-sheet and the bolts are about the same?

A. Very close; yes, sir.

Q. And whatever would break off the bolts would be bound to make a dent in the crown-sheet, wouldn't it?

A. Make a dent in the crown-sheet?

[489] Q. Yes, sir.

A. A pocket?

Q. Some sort of an impression in the crown-sheet, you couldn't break a bolt without making an impression on the crown-sheet, if the crown-sheet did not break, two things of equal hardness, or strength pressed up against one another, if one breaks you see a mark on the other?

A. No, sir.

Q. You couldn't very well strip those bolts off without making a mark on the sheet, could you?

A. If there was no water on the sheet and the sheet got hot, the bolt head would make an impression on the sheet if they were cold.

Q. I don't care what condition the sheet was in, hot or cold, if the pressure brought by that sheet on the bolt head is sufficient to make it break off, it would be bound to leave a mark on the sheet, wouldn't it? Can you hardly conceive it coming off and not do it?

A. It would leave some mark; it would vary according to the temperature of the sheet when it was forced down against the head.

Q. What I am talking about, hot or cold, you would have a mark there?

A. Very slight mark if it was cold.

Q. If it was cold, if the pressure was hard enough to break the bolt cold, wouldn't you expect the same kind of effect on the sheet as you did on the bolt?

A. Not with that flat surface, that wouldn't make much
[490] of an impression in a cold sheet.

Q. You do not think it would?

A. No, sir.

Q. Even if the strain was strong enough to break the bolt?

A. No, I do not think under those conditions that it would leave much of a mark or an impression there.

Q. Those bolts could not have been very well stripped off that crown-sheet without falling down in the fire and getting hot, no matter how they broke, could they?

A. As I said, I do not think there was much fire in this particular case, because when I got in the fire box I found the grates had been broken and twisted all around in there and it seemed the fire was blown out.

Q. I didn't ask you any such question as that.

A. If they dropped in the fire box they would get hot, yes, sir.

Q. That is what I mean, if the fire is right under the crown-sheet and these bolts ripped off like that, from the heat of the fire, sufficient to pull back like that (indicating), it would be impossible for them to strip off there without getting hot?

A. If they fell in the fire they would certainly get hot, if they were left long enough.

Q. And they are bound to fall in the fire, aren't they?

A. They would, of course, if they came off and there was a fire down there they would fall in the fire.

Q. Can you conceive then the bolts breaking or stripping
[491] off that crown-sheet without getting down in the fire and getting hot?

A. I can if the steam came down and put the fire out.

Q. Then the steam would have beat the bolt head down, wouldn't it?

A. The bolt wouldn't be in the fire long enough to heat it. The one or ones that I picked up was on the side of the ash pan where there wasn't any fire.

Q. Can't you find out for us how much water was in that tank when it got to Princeton? I mean how many gallons?

A. Approximately I think I can.

Q. Hasn't that been figured out?

A. I don't know whether it has or not. Do you know, Mr. Slayton?

Q. I mean as to the quantity that was in there.

A. Mr. Slayton had a stick that was marked for those M. C. tenders, do you know how much that was to the inch? (Witness speaking to Mr. Slayton.)

Q. Now, these injectors, what happens to the water that goes into the injector when it breaks?

A. It goes out of the overflow.

Q. The overflow or tell-tale hole?

A. That is what they call the tell-tale.

Q. How big a stream goes out of that?

A. The regular overflow pipe on these engines was 2½ or 3-inch pipe, 3 inches I think, that went into the flare of the ash pan to put out the fire that might drop there, and there was a
[492] three-quarters of an inch pipe just bent around in an L shape so the engineer could see it from the cab, the main overflow went into the ash pan where the engineer could not see it.

Q. If the injector was open and not working there would be three inches of water running out, the full capacity, would be running out and into the ash pan from the tank?

A. If the water valve was open wide enough.

Q. If it was all the way open?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want you to tell me if both water valves were wide open and left wide open an hour, whether or not all the water would run out of that tank, through both of those holes in an hour, if the tank was half full when he started?

A. You mean the water run out of the tank through the injectors?

Q. Through both of the overflows, if both of the overflows were left open.

A. There are two valves there, one is the overflow valve and one is the water valve.

Q. I am talking about the place where the water goes when it flows through the injector and doesn't go into the boiler.

A. If both valves were opened the water would flow from the tank out of the overflow.

Q. Into the ash pan through the pipes?

[493] A. Yes, sir.

Q. If both were left open an hour, wouldn't it throw all the water out of the tank, if the tank was half full when it started?

A. I am not positive about that. If the thing had a siphon to start the water out it probably would carry it all out.

Q. What do you mean by a siphon?

A. I mean if a vacuum was created there and no air pressure opposing it, it would continue to flow.

Q. It would flow—the injector is below the tank?

A. Yes, sir; the overflow runs up some above the injectors, the overflow pipes are above the injectors.

Q. Above the injectors?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If it gets a start it pushes on over, doesn't it?

A. I don't know whether I can answer that question or not. I cannot say I am familiar enough with it.

Q. You mean you don't know whether the water runs through that overflow, runs through that pipe when it starts, don't you know that?

A. I cannot answer that positively; I do not remember exactly the construction of that injector, where the water would go, or whether the water would go there without being forced there.

Q. That injector is a non-lifting injector, and when water is flowing naturally from the tank into the injector without any pressure at all, isn't it bound to flow that way?

A. I don't know whether that water would flow into [494] there or not through the overflow pipes.

Q. Didn't you tell the jury a little while ago it would do it?

A. I do not think so.

Q. Didn't you tell them the water would run through there when it wasn't going into the engine?

A. That is with steam behind it.

Q. The steam doesn't force it into the overflow?

A. Yes, sir; where your injector is working you have got the water valve opened and if it breaks the steam will force that the other way instead of through the boiler.

Q. You don't need any steam to force it, you have got the whole tank of water behind it, haven't you?

A. I think under some conditions that water would be siphoned through that injector ordinarily; I don't know positively wheth-

er it would go through there whenever you opened that water valve or not.

Q. If both of those injectors were working and then stopped working wouldn't the water run on out through the overflow?

A. If the injectors had been working and stopped?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. And the water started to go through the overflow?

Q. Yes, sir.

[495] A. In my opinion it would run out; yes, sir.

Q. Can you identify any bolt over there as having been the one you saw that came out of this boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you remember the number of engine that came in this shipment?

A. 462 to 473.

Q. At what intervals did they come, how long apart were they?

A. I do not remember just the interval between each engine, when they were delivered they were coming along, my recollection is —I don't know— I have got them mixed up with some other engines I got, I couldn't say.

Q. They probably came one or two a week, didn't they?

A. I think so.

Q. How long was it after all under that contract came before they commenced sending those under the new contract?

A. I should say, approximately, it must have been about a year.

Q. A year?

A. That is my recollection; that we had been using these ten engines a year before we purchased eight more. I haven't anything to check it with but that is my recollection.

Q. Were they all made from the same specifications?

A. The specifications may have varied in some slight particulars, but I do not know.

Q. They were practically the same engine?

[496] A. Yes, sir; practically the same.

Q. No essential change?

A. No, sir.

Q. I wish you would look at this thing over here and tell us what you think about how hot that thing was heated on the other side there?

A. I don't know that I could tell you that, from the appearance

here, about the fire box, the temperature—I have nothing to tell just what it was.

Q. Was it the ordinary fire box temperature?

A. I cannot give you that exactly.

Q. I do not mean the degrees.

A. From the appearance here I would say about a fire box temperature.

Q. You mean about the heat that water in the boiler is when it is under a pressure of 185 pounds?

A. Something about that.

Q. That is two or three hundred degrees?

A. It looks to me about the same as the fire box heat.

Q. Does it look like there was water in it when it was heated or not?

A. It may have been heated with water on it or off it.

Q. You cannot tell?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know who kept those bolts or bolt heads that came out of this boiler, out there; I do not mean the bolt heads, but the bolts and stays?

A. The boiler shop foreman had instructions to save the [497] bolts. You do not mean the heads?

Q. No, sir; the stays.

A. The boiler shop foreman had instructions to save those bolts, Mr. Bowden.

Q. What did he do with them, do you know?

A. No, sir; I don't know what he did with them.

Q. Don't the bolts help to determine what causes a failure of a crown-sheet like this?

A. The bottom ends of those bolts were blue.

Q. I didn't ask you about the appearance of them. Just read the question to him.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does iron stretch better when hot or cold?

A. It gets softer at the higher temperature and it stretches easier when it is hot.

Q. It stretches even when it is a fire box temperature, if it goes down?

A. Yes, sir; it expands.

Q. If the bags, the slight bagging in between the bolts has been made before the time of failure, say six or eight hours, and the sheet had not leaked any, and the bolts gave way when the metal was in a fire box temperature, you wouldn't look for all the bags to stretch out, would you, which had been previously formed?

A. If the sheet was blown down, do you mean?

[498] Q. At a fire box temperature; yes, sir.

A. If the sheet was blown down in the shape this had been, if there was bagging there, it was bound to stretch or decrease the bagging.

Q. You wouldn't look for it to decrease as much at a fire box temperature as if it had been hot, would you?

A. I think at a higher temperature the less bagging would show there.

Q. Isn't it true that if that crown-sheet had been about a white heat that every sign of a bag would have stretched out of it, if it had been a white heat when it came down?

A. I cannot say that they would all be stretched out, I think there would be some left in there. When those bolts pulled off they relieved the pressure to some extent, but if the pressure remained on it would have stretched them all out.

Q. When metal gets hot it expands, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If there is damage done to one bolt or several bolts, in a crown-sheet ,and the crown-sheet is afterwards heated up to a fire box temperature, wouldn't that have a tendency to close up any little leaks or holes that might have been made there by the expansion of the bolts and also the sheet?

A. I don't know as I understand you. If the sheet had been hot and expanded?

Q. No, I said if the sheet has been injured, if the bolts [499] have been damaged, so that it leaks a little bit.

A. Damaged in what way?

Q. Any kind of way, so it will get a little hole around it and loosen the fit of the thread and then it gets hot, it is heated up to a fire box temperature?

A. I cannot understand. If the bolt is injured, if the bolt is a good fit in the sheet—

Q. (Interposing.) Suppose it was done by previous burning?

A. I don't know how you are going to injure that bolt.

Q. Can't you imagine a bolt getting a little loose or the threads being a little loose?

A. That was in that condition at first and might have leaked a little at first?

Q. I said, assuming it was leaking, and the fire is cold and the water is not up to a boiling point, and the bolts are leaking a little. Now, the engine is fired up to a good hot fire and the pressure is brought up and heat on the bolts and also the crown-sheet is gotten up to a good fire box temperature with a pressure of 185 pounds, now wouldn't that increased heat of the bolts and of the crown-sheet cause an expansion so as to check the leaks which had previously existed?

A. I know if you put a fire into an engine without water in there that you will find it will cause the bolts and some of the steam of the stay-bolts to leak.

Q. That is from expansion, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that is correct, don't you?

[500] A. I have seen it done. I have seen fire put in an engine without any water in it, and the fire was afterwards knocked and by the pressure on the boiler the stay-bolts and flues leaked.

Q. Do you or not think it would have a tendency to stop or check a leak, as was testified to by one of the engineers?

A. No, that would cause a leak.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. When you speak of putting a fire in an engine without any water in it, and it causes the flues and crown-bolts to leak, was it under pressure then?

A. No, sir.

Q. Suppose you heat it up without any water on the crown-sheet with the steam pressure on it, does that have a tendency to make it leak more? I mean to expand it or force it out of position so that it will leak more when water it put on it?

A. If you have pressure on it, it will cause it to leak more when you put water in it.

Q. When you put water in it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were asked about whether these bolts might not

[501] have been burned in the fire after they fell down. If those bolts fell down into the fire and the crown-sheet came down, letting the steam and water out through there, how long was the fire in there after the bolts got in the fire?

A. There was hardly anything left of the ash pan at all except the grates; there was no fire for those things to remain on, it was blown out.

Q. Do you mean to say that an explosion of that kind, with 185 pounds of pressure, would put the fire out instantly, blow it out?

A. It would blow it out and put out what remained in the pan.

Q. You were asked some questions based on the supposition that some of those bolts or heads were cracked around the head. Do you know any way they could be cracked around the head; I mean in the ordinary use of them in the boiler?

A. No, I do not think it is possible to crack, that is, in inserting the bolts. What I was referring to, where you make a test of pulling the bolt heads off, you would have to use a hack saw in order to make it come off, and nick out.

Q. If you do not nick them, where does it break?

A. In the body.

Q. Did you ever see one broken otherwise and pulled out of the head like those are?

[502] A. No, sir.

Q. I mean cold?

A. Yes, I understand.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. How hot was that crown-sheet heated, the one you saw without any water in it?

A. I couldn't say what the temperature was.

Q. Did you look to see what color it was?

A. No; I don't know that the sheet was discolored.

Q. You don't know how hot it was?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, when this crown-sheet blows down up in the front part of the engine, that is, up in the forward part of the crown-sheet, isn't there a brick arch right under there?

A. The brick arch is some distance from that; it starts at the bottom at the flue-sheet and runs up toward the back of the fire box.

Q. It is down below that?

A. Very much below it at the front end; all the flues come between the top of the crown-sheet and the brick arch.

Q. Is the brick arch further to the front or to the back than that? Is it further to the front?

A. It starts at the front and does not run all the way to the back end of the fire box.

Q. If the crown-sheet were to blow down, the first thing
[503] it would hit would be the brick arch, wouldn't it, and all the pressure would go out into the fire box, or it would be given that tendency by the brick arch?

A. The escaping steam would come on the brick arch. I don't know if the crown-sheet would come down that there would be fire enough to heat the brick arch.

Q. And then it would have a tendency to go out in the cab of the engine?

A. Into the ash pan or any other openings there.

Q. You don't know whether that steam blew that fire out or not, do you; you didn't go there?

A. I saw it in Princeton and everything was in such an upset shape, the grates were broken.

Q. But you don't know whether that fire dropped down and stayed down; it might have been cleaned out by a man?

A. There was some cinders and things in the pan, the pan had not been cleaned out when it came in.

Q. You don't know whether the men there, that came there after the accident to move the engine, cleaned out any of it, do you?

A. Judging from the appearance they had not, because the broken grate bars were laying in on top of the little fire that remained in there that the steam did not put out, and the pan had a lot of cinders in it.

Q. That is just your opinion?

A. From appearance; yes, sir.

Q. You don't know?

A. I don't know; I wasn't there, and I cannot say.

[504] (Witness stands aside.)

[505] R. L. BOWDEN, RECALLED.

R. L. Bowden, recalled, for defendant:

Further cross-examination by Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Bowden, what method did you use for testing your stay-bolts?

A. We tested all the rigid stays with a hammer, and under air pressure, and also the principal stays are tested under an air pressure with at least one hundred pounds of air pressure, all flexible stay-bolts.

Q. Air pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you mean by air pressure? Without any water in it?

A. Yes, sir; we turn all the water out and then turn the air in it to expand the boiler as much as one hundred pounds of air will do, in order to locate the broken bolts.

Q. Were these flexible stay-bolts?

A. Which ones?

Q. The ones in this boiler.

A. It had some flexible in it and some rigid.

Q. Were there any caps on them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was any different method of inspection pursued with reference to the caps and those that did not have caps?

A. Yes, sir; those with caps on, we removed the caps and go inside and hit the bolts.

Q. How often.

A. That is done; we remove the caps every annual inspection and as much often as it seems to be necessary. If we have
[506] any doubt of any of them being broken, or show any leaks or anything, we take the caps off.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Were those bolts in any part of the crown-sheet here that he has been asking you about?

A. That had four rows of flexible bolts.

Q. Did any of them fail in this explosion?

A. Yes, sir; they pulled off the same as others; the four front rows were flexible bolts.

Q. You mean the four front rows?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[507] H. T. NEECE, RECALLED.

H. T. Neece, recalled, for defendant:

Further cross-examination by Mr. Hunt:

Q. I now desire to read from page 103 of your record, Mr. Hall, as follows—or first I will ask a question. Didn't you make this

answer to the question which was asked you about your cross-examination, didn't you say as follows: "We had had so much trouble with fellows claiming we had burned engines around there, that was the reason I done that"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You stated that, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir; that is what I stated.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. The question and answer are as follows:

"Q. The purpose of that was to have a light to look at the fire box with, was it not?"

"A. Yes, sir; we had had so much trouble with fellows claiming we had burned the engines around there, that was the reason I done that."

Was that your answer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I want to read to you a portion of your testimony in connection with the answer that was read to you a few minutes ago, and ask you if that was not the way you testified at the former trial:

"By Mr. Hall:

"Q. You lighted it, did you?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. The purpose of that was to have a light to look at the fire box with, was it not?

"A. Yes, sir; we had had so much trouble with fellows claiming we had burned engines around there, that was the reason I done that.

"Q. Take the witness.

"Cross-Examination:

"Q. The complaints around there about your burning engines were so numerous that you thought you would fix yourself on this particular occasion with a lighted torch, is that true?

"A. Well, this thing had happened with an engine that a fellow claimed had been burned there once before, I reckon a year before that.

"Q. Didn't you just say, 'We had had so much trouble around there, of fellows claiming we had burned engines,' is the reason you did it?

"A. That is what I said."

Is that your testimony?

A. Yes, sir.

[507] (Witness stands aside.)

Court adjourn until tomorrow morning, Friday, October the 9th, 9 a. m.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1914, 9. A. M.—MORNING SESSION.

Continuation of evidence on behalf of Defendant.

[508] F. T. SLAYTON.

F. T. Slayton, sworn, for defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Slayton, what is your position with the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Superintendent of motive power.

Q. How long have you had that position?

A. Since December the 9th, 1910.

Q. As superintendent of motive power of the railroad, what are your duties—what part of the work of the company do you have under your charge?

A. I have charge of the mechanical department, the locomotives, cars and machinery.

Q. Before taking that position with the Virginian Railway Company, what experience did you have in connection with boilers and locomotive engines?

A. I began work in the shops in the winter of 1880 to 1881 on the Canadian Pacific, and from there to road service as a fireman, then as a hostler, and then ran a locomotive for between eight and nine years; was then made traveling engineer or what is known here as road foreman of engines, and from that to trainmaster, train supervisor, superintendent, then division master mechanic, then from that to master mechanic of the entire road for nine years, and then superintendent for about a year before I came to this road.

Q. In those various positions, were your duties such as

[509] to make you familiar with locomotive boilers and engines and crown-sheets and their appliances, etc.?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please mention some of the principal railroads that you have been employed by as master mechanic and road foreman of engines and positions of that kind?

A. I have been road foreman of engines and master mechanic, train master and train supervisor on the Chicago & Great Western I was master mechanic and superintendent for ten years on the St. Joseph & Grand Island, and have been here about four years as superintendent of motive power.

Q. Have you had actual shop experience in the working of boilers and building of crown-sheets and repairing boilers and engines, etc.?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you superintendent of motive power when these engines, of which No. 469 was one, were designed and built?

A. Yes, sir; I made the specifications for them.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury what factor of safety you provided for in the crown-sheet of this engine?

A. The crown-sheet was not specified, but a factor of safety was specified on the boiler as a whole, that means that the weakest point in the boiler must have that factor of safety; the boilers were calculated to carry two hundred pounds of steam pressure and have a factor of safety of at least two and one-half. In service we use only a hundred and eighty-five, and the weakest point of that
[510] boiler is supposed to stand two and a half times two hundred pounds pressure.

Q. How many pounds would that be?

A. That would be five hundred pounds pressure to the square inch, without failure, that is, the weakest point in the boiler.

Q. Is that within the requirements of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

A. Yes, sir. At that time the Interstate Commerce Commission had not issued instructions governing those matters, but since that time the Interstate Commerce Commission's rulings have come into effect, and they accept boilers already built with a factor of safety of three—

Q. I wish you would tell the jury according to the construction of this crown-sheet and the tests that were made of the material that went into it, what factor of safety the crown-sheet had?

A. The crown-sheet is probably the strongest part of the boiler, it has a factor of safety in this case of something over thirteen, about

thirteen and three-tenths, that is the crown-sheet would require thirteen and three-tenths times the boiler pressure to force it down.

Q. In connection with these tests that were made of the materials that went into the crown-sheet and the stay-bolts by the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the shop number of the Baldwin
[511] Locomotive Works was what, I do not remember what it was, can you identify that number as being the one that went into engine 469?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

How do you identify it?

Witness:

The Baldwin shop number—

Q. What is that number?

A. 1246-114-E-28.

Q. You have heard that number stated, how do you identify that number as going into 469?

A. The material, or the records of tests of material show the shop number of the engine, that is their description of it, and then they add on that the builder's number, which is also the boiler number which we report to the Government under report showing the construction of that boiler. The Government requires us now to furnish a sheet showing the boiler number of the engine as designated by the builder, it shows also all the principal parts of that boiler, to allow them to check up our figures as to the factor of safety in the boiler, to which we attach blue prints showing the construction of the seams of the different parts of the boiler; it is also a record of the thickness of the plates as well as the tensile strength of the material
[512] of each sheet that goes into the boiler.

Q. And those numbers correspond to 469 or with the serial number in the Baldwin Locomotive Works records?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Court:

That is the point you said you would connect between the serial number and the actual number?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Slayton, I wish you would tell the jury whether or not

this engine as it was designed and built is of such strength to make a good safe engine?

A. Yes, sir; and it was so accepted by the Government.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. According to its design and construction, I wish you would tell the jury what kind of an engine this was as compared with the best grade of locomotives that were being built at the time it was built?

A. We do not know how to build them any better.

[513] Q. What did it cost?

A. This lot cost us approximately $27,000.00 each.

Q. What company built it?

A. The Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. How does that company stand as engine builders?

A. They are one of the oldest locomotive builders in the United States, they build locomotives for practically all countries in the world, and they build probably more than half of the engines that are built in the United States today.

Q. What is the reputation of that company as engine builders?

A. Excellent.

[514] Q. When was this engine built and put into service?

A. I will have to refer to my records on that.

Q. Please do so, and just state when it was delivered to you and put in service.

A. The records show that the engine was built in April, 1912, the engines were delivered to us in May and June.

Q. Have you got the dates when this particular engine, No. 469, was delivered?

A. I haven't the date when that one was delivered.

Q. Was it sometime in the month of May or June, 1912?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What engineman took charge of the engine, or was assigned to that engine and ran it regularly from the time it went into service until the explosion?

A. I met the engines at Sewall's Point and came over the first and second division with this particular engine, as well as with others. On arrival at Roanoke, Engineer Andrews was there, just happened to be the man to catch this engine, and I gave him that engine, assigned him to that engine at that time, and I came with him on that trip from Roanoke to Princeton.

Q. Was that the first time the engine had been run?

A. The engine had been run from the works to Sewall's Point, and then over the first and second division.

Q. And was it run from Roanoke to Princeton carrying [515] a train?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he took charge of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he continue to have that engine as his regular engine from that time on until the explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ride with him on the engine on that first trip and on any subsequent trips?

A. Yes, sir; I rode over the road, the whole distance of the division with him, on the first trip, also on the trip just a little while before the accident, about—I have a record in my pocket of that.

Q. I do not think it is necessary to fix the date exactly, but you say it was just a short time before the accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he make any statement to you in reference to this engine?

A. The first night that I met him at Roanoke he did not want to take the engine; he was very much pleased with the one he had, and he wanted to have enough of these to equip the division, but he did not want to take this engine on account of thinking it was too large an engine, but before we had gotten one-third of the way over the road he asked me to give him the engine instead of an M. B. which was a smaller size, and on the last trip that I rode with him he had [516] nothing but praise for the engine; he said it was the best he had ever run.

Q. Did you run on these engines enough and on this engine enough to know yourself from your experience as an engineer and in shop work, whether or not it was a good engine and perfect in all of its appliances in operation?

A. It certainly was a good engine in every respect.

Q. What inspections are required of those engines?

A. You mean by the shop employees or by the road men or both?

Q. I mean what inspection does the Government require?

A. After filing the sheet with the Government showing the construction of the locomotive, as I have described, we are required to wash the boiler at least every thirty days and make a stay-bolt inspection every thirty days, which consists of striking each stay-bolt in the

entire boiler with a hammer to determine whether or not they are broken. We are required also to have each stay-bolt that is not longer than eight inches drilled three-sixteenths of an inch, inch and a quarter deep, from the upper end extending into the water leg of the boiler, because those bolts are more liable than any others in the boiler to break in service, and if they break they always fail near the outer sheet, and should one break they immediately leak the size of that three-sixteenths hole out to the atmosphere.

Q. Were those bolts that are most liable to break the ones that were broken in this explosion?

A. Those are not required to be drilled; no, I have never known one to break, these long bolts. That was every month, that that was required. Every three months we are required to make a
[517] thorough inspection, a hydrahaulic test, and put a test on the boiler and test the pops and all appliances. Then every three years we are required to take all the flues out of the boiler or sufficient to enter the boiler and examine it all the way around, examine all the braces and examine all the seams.

Q. That is a three-year inspection?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. This engine had not been in service long enough to go through with that inspection, had it?

A. No, sir; the first sheet filed answered that inspection.

Q. And had it been inspected in these monthly inspections ever since it had been in operation?

A. Yes, sir; there was a report sent in every month to the Government of those monthly inspections.

Q. Rules of the company requiring an engineer to inspect were introduced in evidence. Now, does an engineer who runs an engine look after the inspection between the monthly inspections?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that his duty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is anybody else required to inspect it between those monthly inspections?

A. Yes, sir; we have men at each terminal who are required every time a boiler is washed, it doesn't matter whether it is
[518] at the time the Government requires them or not, we wash them oftener in service to see that the guage cocks, water glass mountings are open, try them and see that they shut off tightly and that they open.

Q. That is when the boilers are washed out?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How about the crown-sheet inspection, is anybody else required to inspect that except the engineer between these monthly inspections?

A. The boilermaker inspectors at the roundhouse, that is their duty to inspect at all times, they do not go in every trip because the fire is not out; the men in charge of handling the engines at terminals are required to inspect.

Q. Are any rules in print requiring those inspections?

A. They do not deal with all of the inspections. Our rules in print require the engineer to make a thorough inspection of his engine before, during and after each trip and report all defects found.

Q. Is it the custom of engineers to make those inspections before and after each trip?

Q. Yes, sir.

[519] (Manuscript pages 519 to 522, inclusive, marked out.)

[523] Q. In other words, my question is, was anybody required to inspect this engine between that time and the time of the explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

If there is any record to that effect and Mr. Slayton speaks from the record and not from personal knowledge of the inspection, it is manifest that the record ought to be produced.

By the Court:

Don't refer to any rule of your company.

By Mr. Hall:

I am not doing that, I am just asking the facts.

Q. Who had to make that inspection?

A. The engineer, as I have said, is required to inspect the engine each trip.

Q. Now, something was said here about engine 473, was this in the same order of engines that were delivered along with 469?

A. No, sir.

Q. When was 473 delivered?

A. Engine 472 to 479 were built in December, 1912, and they were delivered the latter part of December, I believe, and the fore part of January.

Q. You heard what was said here about the crown-sheet of 473 being scorched. I wish you would state how long 473 had been in service when that developed?

A. She had, I believe, made one or two trips over the [524] road, over that division.

Q. What was the nature of the burn or scorch on engine 473?

A. The engine was reported as having a scorched spot on her crown-sheet. I went over to examine it and found that on the right hand side, towards the back, that is, towards the fire box end of the engine, there was a spot, oh, probably as large as my hand or a little bit larger, where there had been an accumulation of borings and drill cuttings, and evidently white lead that was used in lubricating the taps, which cut the stay-bolt holes, or the drill, and that had lodged on that crown-sheet in that spot, and that being thick enough to keep the water away from the sheet, the sheet had been overheated.

Q. How was the scorched place shown, what evidence was there there of it?

A. The sheet inside the fire box had turned a blue color and the soot wasn't appearing thereon.

Q. On the fire box side?

A. Yes, sir; and there was a slight pocketing between the stay-bolt heads.

Q. Was there any leaks?

A. Yes, sir; that is how it was discovered.

Q. If there had been any filings or whatever you found on the crown-sheet of 473, on the crown-sheet of 469, would that have been there at a time when it could have caused the explosion when the crown-sheet blew down.

A. No, sir; it could not have been.

[525] Q. Why?

A. The engine had been in service so long and the boiler had been washed repeatedly. No. 473 had never been washed since the engine had been received; it had not been in service long enough to require a washing.

By Mr. Hunt:

Did you ever see the boiler of 469 washed?

Witness:

I don't know that I have seen that particular one washed.

By Mr. Hunt:

Well, please do not testify to it if you never saw it.

Q. Do you know how often every boiler of every engine that you have got under you is washed?

A. They are washed about every ten days and a record kept of it.

Q. My question wasn't about your record, whether you kept any record or not. My question is simply this, as to whether or not under the requirements of your company that the boiler of every locomotive in service had to be washed at intervals of ten days?

By Mr. Hunt:

We have no objection to that.

[526] A. The requirements are not every ten days; the requirements are every thirty days and oftener if the conditions make it necessary.

Q. In actual practice, how often are the boilers of the engines in the same class of service that 469 was, actually washed?

A. Every ten days.

Q. Something has been said about blowing up steam on this engine 469 on a trip made on it by Engineer Massie. Does the fact that the steam had to be blown up on that engine indicate—

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to that.

Q. I will put the question this way, then: Does the blowing up of steam on that engine show that there was any defect with the crown-sheet at all?

A. It has no bearing in that direction at all.

Q. What does it indicate?

A. It indicates one of several things: we might have had a poor tank of coal on that particular trip; we did have a new fireman.

Q. Who was the fireman?

A. His name was Carr.

Q. Was he an experienced fireman at that time?

A. No, sir.

Q. Does it often happen in the operation of engines that when the fireman is inexperienced that he is not able to keep up the fire, so as to keep up steam?

A. It does; he has to learn to do the work.

[527] Q. I wish you would describe to the jury just in a general way where this particular crown-sheet that was blown down is located, and what the construction of the fire box and the boiler of the engine is at that point?

A. Wouldn't it be quicker and better to refer to the print showing the blue print of the boiler?

Q. Can you do it better on a blackboard or by a blue print?

A. I think I can do it better with a blue print; I am not much of a draftsman.

Q. Very well, do it with a blue print then.

A. This is not a large section, but I presume the jury can see it better here.

By the Court:

That is the blue print of this boiler?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

A. These heavy lines here show the outside one, show the outline of the outer shell of the boiler; this represents the end of the boiler, there is the door hole through which the fireman throws his coal, the grates are located from there to here. This is of course a comparatively small scale, the cab extends up like that and back over that way; there is where the engine crew is located, the engineer on the right side, the fireman on the left; this shows as if the boiler was cut through the middle, just split through.

[528] Q. I will ask you if that blue print shows correctly the section of that engine and shows the crown-sheet and fire box of the engine?

A. Yes, sir; it is gotten out by the Baldwin Locomotive Works who built the engine.

Q. All I want to know is whether it correctly shows the section of the boiler, about the parts there that I have asked you?

A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. Now, just go ahead and point out where the fire box is located and where the crown-sheet is located?

A. This is the boiler head in the cab, extending up here; this is the top of the boiler shell which has been spoken of as the wagon top; this is the barrel of the boiler or dome sheet; this is the dome located up here; this sheet goes down from the dome sheet to the smallest part of the boiler or the barrel as it is called; this is the front flue sheet where the flues end, and from here to that point is the smoke box where the gases pass out into the stack.

Q. We are not interested in the smoke stack.

A. This is the forward end of the boiler proper; that is the

lowest side of the boiler.

Q. Where are the flues located?

A. Let's get the fire box located first. This is the mud ring, as we call it, the foundation ring, that makes a space between these two sheets and those two, and the other sheet along the side; that is the fire box in the opposite part of the boiler. Now, the fire
[529] box proper is obscured by this part here from the mud ring at that point up here to the door hole where it is flanged out here, and here, and it extends on to this crown-sheet; this is the flue-sheet, the flues now extend from this sheet here to the forward flue-sheet; there are 270 two and a quarter inch flues in this particular boiler, nineteen feet long; it is nineteen feet from there to here, and there are forty-five and a half inch tubes in there also, which are used for the superheating of steam. This shows the front and back legs of the boiler, the sides are smaller, the idea being to have water surrounding the fire on all sides. This sheet is not exposed to the fire at any point without water on the opposite side of the sheet.

Q. That sheet above, running right across there, I wish you would state whether that is the particular sheet that failed in this engine?

A. Yes, sir; that sheet in this engine, in this lot of engines, is the one that extends from the mud ring on the one side up over the roof of the boiler and over to the mud ring on the other side; there is no seams in that sheet itself; it is, of course, riveted there and here to the front or back of the flue-sheet of the boiler and the door-sheet.

Q. How large is the opening there at the door?

[530] A. It is 11 by 22, that is, 11 inches high and 22 inches wide.

Q. How high is it above the platform in front of it on which the fireman stands when he throws coal into it?

A. You measure from there to there and it is about 36 inches; the deck is, that the fireman stands on, is located about there; it is about 22 inches from the deck up to the lower part of the fire box door.

Q. Where is the brick arch located?

A. The brick arch is located at this end just below the lower flue, so as not to interfere with the draft through the flue, then it extends up at an angle like that ,and clear across the fire box.

Q. Just take your pencil and draw a line there indicating the location of it and how it extends back there?

A. I have a drawing over there that will show it better.

Q. Just put it on this.

A. (Witness does so.) Something like that. This is a series of brick about four or five inches thick that are supported on arch tubes that extend through this sheet here, and this one up here, and they rest on these arch tubes.

Q. Is this brick arch from that point down to here solid?

A. It is made up so that the bricks fit together and there are certain sections of brick that rest on the tube; we can take out one section at a time, but it covers it solid, the whole place, but it covers it solid, the whole place, except the little opening between
[531] the brick here and the flue-sheet, to allow any cinders that might accumulate on there to fall through. The fire is on the grate from there to there, which is 9 feet 6 inches, and the width of the grates is six feet.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, how much of a slope is there in this crown-sheet from this point back to this point?

A. Four and three-eighths inches, that is, when the engine is level; this sheet here, this end of the sheet is four and three-eighths inches higher than the sheet there (indicating).

Q. When the water gets low in one of these engines, would that part of the crown-sheet be the first that is uncovered?

A. The first to be exposed would be right there (indicating).

Q. And as the water goes down does it get off the rest of it?

A. It extends further down this way (indicating).

Q. What part of this crown-sheet that is here was actually blown down?

A. That row of holes, the small holes next to the post there, are the rivet holes that connect that sheet, which is this sheet here, to this flanged flue-sheet, and it extends back something like to there (indicating).

Q. Back to the line you have marked?

[532] A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you got another blue print that shows the actual position that was forced into?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would get that and point it out on it.

(Witness does so.)

Q. Does the blue print which I hold in my hands marked "Section through Fire Box", show the crown-sheet in the same position that the large blue print does that we have just been talking about?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How have you indicated on the blue print marked "Section

through Fire Box", the position that the crown-sheet was in when it blew down by the explosion?

A. By a dotted line.

Q. Was the part of this crown-sheet from where these dotted lines run into the sheet, from there on down to the lowest point of the sheet, was that injured at all in this explosion?

A. It wasn't injured, it was heated a little further but not sufficiently to weaken it, to allow it to come down.

Q. Were any of the stay-bolts broken in that part down there?

A. No, sir; none back here.

Q. Now, the brick arch in there, as you have indicated it on that blue print, which we will refer to as being marked "3-D", what position would a man have to get into in order to see the crown-sheet through the door?

A. He would have to get down so that his line of vision [533] would pass the corner of that arch, to see up here he would have to get down below the top edge of the door, pass the upper corner of the arch to see the sheet.

Q. He couldn't see the crown-sheet at all through the brick arch?

A. No, sir.

Q. In the blue print marked "Section through Fire Box", which I have just shown you, is there indicated another section of the crown-sheet showing a number of stay-bolts that failed in this explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How are they shown on that blue print?

A. The ones which broke off at the time the sheet came down are shown in solid white dots, those which remained, that is, the button stay-bolts which remained and were not broken off entirely, and those not damaged at all, are just described by a circle, the same size as the dot.

Q. I will ask you to identify the blue print marked "3-D" as Exhibit A, and the blue print marked "Section through Fire Box" as Exhibit B, and file them with your answer.

A. I will here file them as requested.

Q. I hand you another blue print which I will ask the stenographer to designate as Exhibit C, and ask you whether or not [534] that shows a section of this boiler over the fire box?

By Mr. Hunt:

Your Honor will allow us just to save a general exception to the

introduction of these blue prints upon the ground that they have not been authenticated.

By the Court:

I think they ought to be authenticated.

By Mr. Hall:

That is what I am doing now. I am proving by this witness that they correctly show the construction of the boiler and that is an authentication of them.

By Mr. Hunt:

I would like to ask a question as a basis of objection. Have you checked the construction of this engine and each part with that blue print that you have before you?

Witness:

Each part?

By Mr. Hunt:

Yes, sir.

Witness:

No, sir; not each part of the entire engine.

By Mr. Hunt:

Of the fire box?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

You have?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

This is nothing but a survey and if a survey is to be authenticated it must be authenticated by the party who made the survey or some one who has checked the survey. If he has checked those parts there about which he has been asked, that is a verification of those parts.

Exceptions.

Q. Now, please read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. This one shows a cross section cut through the fire box in

this way (indicating); this shows the outer shell of the boiler, and this the fire box sheet. This is the position normally; this
[535] is the position from there to there, shown in the dotted lines where the sheet was after the accident.

Q. So then, if I understand you, the red line at the top of it shows the normal position of the sheet?

A. The top of the red line.

Q. And the dotted line shows the position the sheet took after the explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, when did you first see this engine after the failure?

A. The next morning.

Q. Did you make any examination of it, or were you present when any examination of it was made?

A. I made no examination until the two Government inspectors arrived.

Q. What did you have done with the fire box of this engine until they did arrive?

A. As soon as I heard of the accident, I sent our road foreman of engines, Mr. Houston, to accompany the engine to Princeton, with instructions not to allow anybody to disturb anything about the engine.

Q. When it got to Princeton, what did you do with it?

A. When it got to Princeton the openings in the cab were fastened up with canvas that night to prevent any one getting in. The next morning we removed the canvas and applied—

By Mr. Hunt:

(Interposing.) Were you up there when that was done?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

When the canvas was put on?

Witness:

Yes, sir; that evening.

[536] Q. Now finish your answer.

A. And applied boards back of the cab to make it more secure.

Q. When this inspection was made who was present?

A. Mr. Lewis, my assistant; Mr. Bowden, our chief boiler-

maker, or foreman boilermaker; Mr. Houston, the road foreman of engines; and I do not recall any others at the time we were making the inspection of the boiler, except the two Government inspectors.

Q. When this engine failed did you notify the chief boiler inspector of the United States Government?

A. At Washington?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir; by wire.

Q. Did he send those two boiler inspectors there to make this inspection of the engine to determine what was the cause of the failure?

A. Yes, sir; we are required by law to notify them, if there is any personal injury.

Q. And they were sent there pursuant to that notice?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you went into that fire box, what did you find [537] as to the condition of the crown-sheet?

A. The crown-sheet was bagged down as indicated by the dotted lines on the blue print submitted. The bolt heads, or quite a number of the bolt heads, were found laying on the grates in the fire box and in the ash pan. The grates were blown down into the ash pan, and the supports for the grates were broken. The ash pan was blown down from its support at the mud ring, until it rested on the engine frame; the brick arch was blown down, there was a few bricks remaining up.

Q. Are these the bolt heads that were produced at the trial of this case in the Federal Court at Roanoke, and produced here, numbered from one to twelve, the bolt heads that were picked up in the fire box and on the platform of that engine at the time the inspection was made of it?

A. There are some there that were not shown at the Federal Court, but they were all picked up in the fire box at that time.

Q. How many of these twelve bolt heads were shown in the trial in the Federal Court?

A. Nine.

Q. Where were the other three then?

A. At that time?

Q. Yes.

A. They were in the pigeon hole in my desk, in my office.

Q. Have you had those three ever since the explosion, [538] in your desk?

A. Ever since that morning after the explosion occurred:

yes, sir.

Q. Is that the crown-sheet that is produced here that was taken out of the engine?

A. That is a part of the crown-sheet that was in the engine; yes, sir.

Q. Is that the part that was forced down or buckled, as we call it, as shown by the blue print, the dotted lines on the blue print, which you have introduced in evidence?

A. Of course, it extends a little further than the pocketing there; it includes all the pocketed area and a little that is not, that is, the two corners there that are not pocketed.

Q. When you went into that engine to make that inspection, what were the indications there to show, if any, that it had been blown down without any water on top of it?

A. From the fire box side there was first the color, which was very distinctive, the absence of soot on the part that had been hot, the form the sheet was in, between the stay-bolts' support, the opening of the seam between the crown-sheet and where it is riveted to the flue-sheet, which is the first indication I looked for in a scorched sheet.

Q. That is on the bottom side?

A. The bottom side of the crown-sheet.

Q. Next to the fire box?

[539] A. Then the flues indicated down on the first row of flues that they had been heated, the line across the flue-sheet showed the color that the crown-sheet had where it had been overheated.

Q. Was the flue-sheet bent down?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, take the color first. If that crown-sheet had failed with water on top of it, what color would it have been?

A. It would be the same color as the rest of the fire box, which is a black sooty color, and it would be coated with soot as they always are.

Q. Would it present a blue color which is shown in the present case?

A. No, sir.

Q. How about the soot on it if it failed with water on top of it, even though it had been previously burned?

A. Soot is carbon, and carbon will burn on hot iron, it will not burn at the temperature it is when it adheres to the sheet, that is, in contact with water on the opposite side, and for that reason when a

sheet is heated to a red heat it burns the carbon soot off the sheet.

Q. Does the bottom side of that sheet now show the soot on the parts of it that were not burned?

A. Yes, sir; it shows some. Of course, it had been handled a great deal in getting it out, and some has rubbed off but still it shows.

Q. Now, what conditions did you find on the top part of
[540] the sheet that indicated it had no water on it at the time it went down?

A. After removing the auxilliary dome, which is located in the dome sheet of the boiler just ahead of the fire box, we went down in on top of the flues and you could get right up to the crown-sheet and there all of the stay-bolts which are located four inches apart were exposed, extending from the roof of the sheet or outside of the sheet of the boiler down to a point right to the holes they were originally in, and they were all broken off at the lower end, the heads had pulled off.

Q. Just as these show here?

A. Yes, the ends of the bolts were the same color of the head, that is at the end, then the heat extended, or the color extended, and blended from a bluish condition at the lower end up above the distance on the bolts, those parts, the head end of the crown-sheet was the highest point, the coloring extended up probably an inch and a half or two inches, though further back it was shorter and it of course blended out to where there was no discoloration, because it had not been hot enough, the coating of the lime still remaining on the bolts.

Q. How about the line of coloring on the sheet itself on the top side?

A. The sheet, well, there was no coating of lime, the engine had not been in service long enough to get anything like a heavy coating
of lime. There was a very light coating of lime that ap-
[541] peared on the top of the sheet and extended a little along on the side, a little beyond where the last row of heads pulled off, it extended down to the next row of stays almost along the line of the other row of stays on the other side, and back at the rear the coloring extended about three to four rows back, to the furthest bolt that pulled off, that is, there was some coloring but that blended off also.

Q. Was that line of demarcation between where the water was on the sheet and where it was off, clear and unmistakable at that time?

A. Yes, sir; perfectly clear.

Q. Can it be seen now?

A. Yes, sir; it can be seen yet, though not to so great an extent.

Of course, you cannot see how far it extended back on account of its not having been necessary to cut the sheet back that far, it had not been hot enough to distort the sheet to justify our cutting off more of the sheet.

Q. Taking these bolt heads, Mr. Slayton, that were picked up there at the time, what does the contour of the top side of these bolt heads indicate with reference to whether they were hot or cold at the time the sheet was put in that condition? I mean at the time the explosion occurred?

A. They show unmistakably that they were hot when
[542] they were formed that way, considering the fact that they were only in contact with a thin sheet.

Q. How is the top surface of these bolt heads shaped in a normal position before they have been distorted and forced out of shape?

A. The face of the head is at right angles to the length of the bolt, the center line of the bolt turns in a lathe that way (indicating), it couldn't be otherwise.

Q. Mr. Slayton, can you force a bolt head in that shape cold with a three-eighths of an inch sheet like that over it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the sheet is not strong enough to do it.

Q. Which is the harder metal, the sheet or the bolt?

A. The sheet is tough steel the bolt is soft iron, made soft so that it will rivet over. Iron is softer than steel, that is, when cold, of course.

Q. When these bolt heads were forced in that position, did the sheet surrounding these bolt heads have the same shape or was it bagged between the bolt head in the same shape that these bolt heads are?

A. It must have been, there was nothing else to put them in that shape.

Q. Was that bagging greater before the sheet broke loose and was forced down than it was before the bolt heads broke loose and while they were put in that shape?

A. I didn't get that question just right.

[543] Q. The question is this, was the sheet bagged between the bolt heads so as to force the bolt heads in the position before the bolt heads were broken off?

A. It must have been.

Q. Before they were broken off, was the bagging of the sheet

greater between the bolt heads than it is now, since it has been forced down ten and three-quarter inches out of its normal shape?

A. It must have been bagged much worse than it is now, between the bolt heads, yes, between the bolt heads, to force them in that shape.

Q. What effect would the forcing of that sheet down ten and three-quarter inches from its normal position have on these bags between the bolt heads?

A. It would of course have to stretch the sheet to cover the greater distance, and it would stretch the sheet where it was easiest to stretch, the point of least resistance; of course, it would be easier to stretch the pockets out than to stretch the solid metal.

Q. Have you made, from actual measurements of the shape of these bolt heads, a diagram showing the shape in which that sheet was forced in order to make the bolt heads assume that shape?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does this represent a life size diagram of the crown-sheet and the position of the bolt heads and stay-bolts in it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you to identify this drawing as Exhibit D
[544] and file it as a part of your answer.

A. Very well, I will do so.

By the Court:

That is made from actual measurements?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir; actual size.

Q. Does the sheet from this last stay-bolt on the right side of it to the end of the sheet on the left side of it indicate the actual curvature of the sheet when it is in its normal position?

A. Yes, sir; this black line over here, the solid line, and the white, between the two black lines from here to there, show the actual position of the sheet normally, that is, the radius of that crown-sheet is 96 inches, that is, a circle struck from a point 8 feet below, that is, it represents a 16-foot circle.

Q. Do the black lines there indicate how the sheet stands with reference to the button-head bolts and the part that is held by them when the sheet is in its normal position?

A. It does.

Q. What does this red line along the crown-sheet indicate?

A. This represents the present contour and the red indicates

the position the sheet must have been in to bear on the bolts and force it to that position at the time it was put into the position it is now, or the shape it is now.

Q. Could that crown-sheet have forced those bolt heads
[545] into the shape that they are now unless it took the form of the red line there indicated by the diagram?

A. No, sir.

Q. When the crown-sheet was pocketed, as shown by that diagram, was it hot or cold, that is, did it have water on top of it or not?

A. It did not have water in contact with it, that is certain.

Q. What not?

A. Because it could not have been heated that way with water on it.

Q. Can a crown-sheet be heated so as to make it pocket in that way with any degree of heat you can put under it with water on top of it; I mean with any degree of heat in a locomotive?

A. No, sir.

Q. In your experience as a master mechanic, superintendent of motive power, and an engineer, extending over how many years, since 1880?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen button-head bolts broken off under the head in the way these are broken when the crown-sheet wasn't hot on top?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why is it that they will not break off in the head in that way when there is water on top of the sheet?

A. If there is water on top of the sheet they are prac-
[546] tically in the same condition that they would be cold, that is, they would have the same tensile strength and they are always made larger under the head than they are in the body of the bolt, and I never have witnessed the test or heard of one where a bolt head could be pulled off, it always broke the bolt in the body, that is, out where it was reduced in size.

Q. How much larger are these bolts right at the head than they are in the body of the bolt?

A. The bolt is one and three-sixteenths of an inch at the head before it is threaded, and the bolt out in the body is an inch.

Q. With the threads in it, is the bolt larger right at the head than it is in the body?

A. Yes, sir; at the root of the thread, that is, at the bottom of the thread, the smallest diameter under there is greater than the body

of the bolt.

Q. What does a break in these bolts, that is, down in the head, indicate?

A. That indicates that the bolt was hot.

Q. Why did it break down into the head that way?

A. Because it was hot, the bolt as it extends up into the crown-sheet would convey some of the heat away and the outside of the head of the bolt would be hotter than it was right in the center where the head had contact with other metal to carry it away.

Q. In order to break a bolt that way, assuming that the bolt is cold, that is, has water on top of the crown-sheet, is the area of surface that is to be broken or disrupted greater than the cross section
[547] of the bolt?

A. It certainly is, it breaks down in, of course it is dished out and there is more surface to separate than if broken straight across, normally, if it was cold or in a normal condition, it would break straight across through the smallest section, or the least area.

Q. Have you seen any of these bolts broken at the head in the testing machine?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. When they were cold?

A. Yes, sir; and hot.

Q. How do they break when they are cold?

A. They never break at the head; we couldn't get them to break at the head; they always break in the body; the bolt pulls apart out in the inch section.

Q. Did you fix any of them so they would break at the head?

A. We tried it.

Q. I say, did you try to break any bolts in the head? In other words, did you cut a groove around there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you did that, how did the bolt break?

A. You mean, cut a groove around the head and bolt?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, sir; I did not make that test.

Q. You didn't make any test of that sort?

A. No, sir.

Q. How did they break when you pulled them in the
[548] testing machine hot?

A. Some broke just like those and others a little different, depending on the degree of temperature.

Q. When Professor Randolph was on the stand the other day,

he was asked to pick out certain bolts in the lot of bolts that were before him, and he picked out bolts Nos. 2 and 3, and the bolt designated by the figure 9, as being broken in a certain way. I wish you would tell the jury where bolts 2 and 3 came from, indicated by the dots on them.

A. Bolts 2 and 3 were picked out of the fire box of engine 469 after the explosion; that is, the heads were.

Q. Where did bolt head No. 9 come from?

A. No. 9 was found on one of the bolts that came from the crown-sheet of engine 469, was fitted into the sheet the same as the original construction of the engine.

By Mr. Staples:
Was that done by you?

Witness:
Yes, sir; I witnessed it.

Q. Go ahead.

A. And heated—well, first it was screwed into the sheet until the three-quarters of an inch square extension on the bolt head, which is left there for screwing them in, was twisted off, until it twisted that three-quarters of an inch section off; the head was heated to a dull red, the end of the bolt, and pulled in the testing machine until it pulled the head off.

Q. And was the head in that shape and the break in it,
[549] in that shape, when it failed under those conditions?

A. That is just as it came from the testing machine.

Q. You say this was heated to a dull red heat when it was pulled?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Professor Randolph says that this bolt head, No. 9, looked to him, after a careful examination with a microscope, that it was broken colder than the bolt heads 2 and 3. I wish you would examine the three and see if you can see any difference between them, or have you examined them?

A. I have not compared them in that way.

Q. I wish you would please do so.

A. Now, what is the question?

Q. The question is whether the color of those bolts indicates any difference in the temperature, whether No. 9 was colder, as Professor Randolph says, when it was broken, than 2 or 3?

A. I do not see but very little difference in the color; there is a

little difference in the fracture.

Q. What does the difference in the fracture indicate as to which was the colder when they were broken?

A. I would say that No. 9 shows that it was not as hot as the others; it shows some fiber in the iron, all the fiber has not been destroyed to the extent it is in the other two.

Q. So you agree with the Professor about that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But No. 9 was broken at a dull red heat?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you pull any of the other bolt heads or stay-bolts that came out of that engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just describe how you pulled them.

[550] A. That (indicating) was another head formed on a bolt with the same lot that came from this same crown-sheet, formed in the regular way and made the same size.

Q. What number was that? Are you speaking of No. 9 now?

A. No, sir; I am speaking of No. 7.

Q. Where is that?

A. I don't know; I think it is there.

Q. Is this it?

A. Yes, sir; that is one that was heated to a higher temperature and pulled in the same way; that was screwed in.

Q. This is the figure 7?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. There are no dots on that?

A. No, sir; that is not one of the twelve.

A. That was pulled in the same way after heating, only it was heated to a red heat, not to a clear red well something like a cherry, and pulled until the head pulled off.

Q. And that took that form when it dropped?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And broke in the head?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the rest of the bolt heated besides the head?

[551] A. No, sir; it was heated just as near the condition we assumed existed in the fire box, as we could get it.

Q. Did you pull any of these other bolts?

A. Yes, I pulled two before anything was done to them at all.

Q. You pulled them cold?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where and how did they break?

A. They did not have heads on them, they broke in the body; the idea was to find the quality of the iron and get the tensile strength, reduction of area, and percentage of stretch, etc.

Q. State to the jury about these two bolts that came out of the crown-sheet of this engine, when they were pulled cold?

A. Bolt No. 1 was one inch and six thousandths in diameter, that gave us an area of .795 square inches.

Q. It is not necessary to go into details or figures, just tell us what tensile strength it developed under that test to the square inch.

A. It broke at 40,100 pounds, or 50,440 tensile strength
[552] per square inch.

Q. 50,440 pounds?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does that compare, the tensile strength of that bolt, with the original strength of the material, as it was tested when it went into the engine?

A. Right along with it, there was very little difference in the tensile strength of each test.

Q. How about the other bolts that you pulled cold, what tensile strength did it develop?

A. 50,600.

Q. To the square inch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were those the only two you pulled cold?

A. No, sir; these were the only two pulled before we formed them into bolts to test the other part. I then had seven of these same bolts heated up in the usual way in a bolt heating machine, made them the original size that they were when they were put in the engine, except we made the square seven-eighths instead of three-quarters, to enable us to have enough metal there to make another test, which we wanted to determine. I brought one of those bolts just as it came from the forging machine, with the head formed on it, I brought another with the head formed on it, and turned down to the size it is made before the threads were cut.

Q. Where are those bolts?

[553] A. They were locked in the vault here in the Clerk's office.

Q. Please get them.

(Witness here produces said bolt.)

Q. I wish you would pick out the two bolts now and show them to the jury that you pulled cold, and that stood the strain which you

have described?

A. There is bolt No. 1.

Q. And this is bolt No. 2. Now hold it up and show the jury how they pulled and in what shape they were when they broke under the test. Were those two bolts elongated and the size of the bolt reduced at the point of breaking there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As shown by these bolts when they broke.

A. One end is gripped in the machine here, the other down here, and it is pulled until it does break, the reduction there shows that this was the weakest point between the two bars where it was gripped and before it is pulled it is laid off here in eight inches, stamped one inch apart, to get the elongation, the stretch in the eight inches. It is caliphered beforehand to get the diameter, and then it is caliphered after the fracture to see how much it is reduced in size before it broke.

Q. How much did it stretch in the eight inches?

A. I haven't that; I didn't make a note of that in my book; I do not think I have the elongation on the top, but I have the tensile strength.

Q. Do you know how much it reduced in area before it [554] broke?

A. Yes, sir; I have on those two; I have it all; reduction in the area, 47.3 per cent on No. 1, 37.9 on No. 2.

Q. You mean that No. 1 became 47.3 per cent smaller in area across here before it actually pulled in two?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And No. 2 37.9 per cent smaller?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much did they stretch?

A. The per cent of elongation was 26.25 per cent on No. 1, and 24.50 per cent on No. 2, that is, a section 8 inches long was stretched to 10.1 inches and 9.96 on the other.

Q. What does that indicate as to the character of the material?

A. It indicates or proves that it comes within the specifications for the stay-bolt iron as specified for the engine.

Q. Does it show that it was a high grade material, or not?

A. Yes, sir; for the purpose.

Q. What was the next test that you made of this material?

A. The testing hot as I have described.

Q. I wish you would pick out the bolt that this was broken from, which is No. 7.

A. There is the plate that it was pulled through in this
[555] test, the bolt was screwed into this sheet, it was threaded and heated the same as this perfect bolt here, screwed into the sheet, the sheet inverted with the bolt now over the fire and heated to this one was a cherry red, or about a cherry red, and then it was put into the machine with this plate resting on a circular opening about ½ inches in diameter, which is gripped in the machine and pulled until it broke, and that broke right under the head.

Q. Was the rest of the bolt heated?

A. No, sir; of course the heat extended up here a little ways on the bolt, but it wasn't heated up here.

Q. You say this was heated to a cherry red?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now ,what other test did you make of that material?

A. We described No. 9, this is the bolt and this is the plate that No. 9 was pulled in, and you had the head of the bolt over there; this was pulled in a similar way only it was not so hot.

Q. This is No. 9?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that broke under the head?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I believe 9 was pulled at a dull red heat?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you pull any more of them?

A. Yes, sir; some cold.

Q. What did they do when you pulled them cold?

A. They invariably broke in the body of the bolt.

[556] Q. Just describe how you pulled No. 8.

A. No. 8 was screwed into a three -eighths of an inch plate tight and pulled cold until the bolt broke in the body, it broke at 41,550 pounds tensile strength.

Q. Tensile strength?

A. No, that is what it broke at, the tensile strength was greater because the area is less than an inch, that was the actual breaking point.

Q. This seems to be loose on here and does not screw off, how did that happen?

A. Because the threads are stripped in there.

Q. How were those threads stripped and why were they stripped?

A. By the pull, or the strain on the bolt. This is No. 6.

OOR COPY

Q. Was that pulled cold, No. 6?

A. No. 6 was screwed into the plate with a three-foot wrench until the thread in the sheet was stretched; we left this large square so that we would have enough metal there to enable us to strip this thread in the sheet; I don't know whether the thread in the bolt or the sheet stripped, anyway we turned it until we could turn it right around, the idea being to put as much strain on the head as possible in that way, and then it was pulled in the machine the same way as the others were, and is broke in the body.

Q. In screwing this bolt up until the threads were
[557] stripped, did that injure the bolt in the head as far as the test showed?

A. I have not been able to examine the head, but as far as the test showed it did not, because it broke in the body when it was pulled.

Q. Did you make any other test of this material?

A. I think that covered all the bolts that I took to the testing machine.

Q. You tested two of them cold?

A. Yes, sir; and two hot, and two before we did anything to them, and then I brought two in different stages of manufacture.

Q. Which are those?

A. That one there is just as it came from the forging machine after having had the heat put on it; first, I had to cut off the end of the bolt because it had some threads on it, and then they were all heated far enough up here, in the furnace, to enable the forging machine to force the metal into that shape, that forms a square on here with which to turn them in forms of button-head, and enlarges the bolt at that point to give us material to cut the threads on, to give the area of the size in the sheet.

Q. That just represents one stage of manufacture of a button-head stay-bolt, does it?

A. Yes, sir; and this out here shows a flow of metal as it was squeezed out between the dies in forming that head.

Q. What does this bolt represent?

A. That is the next stage of manufacture in regular prac-
[558] tice for this size bolt, and this head is made three-quarters of an inch, and we had it made seven-eighths, to give us power to strip the threads off in the sheet.

Q. If you made it the size usually made, what would have happened when you tried to strip the threads off?

A. We feared it would twist this off before the bolt took the thread, and we wanted to go to the extreme and strip the thread.

Q. To see whether that would injured the bolt in the head?

A. Yes, sir; they are always three-fourths or seven-eighths and are nicked here in another machine as you see on the corner, to make them easy to break, for in screwing in sometimes they are broken off and sometimes they are left, different roads have different ideas, then it was turned in the machine, the next stage to that shape to enable us to put the threads in, faced off and turned down, to this size, and then it was ready for the thread. This is the bolt when it is threaded, but it is not one of this lot, this is one we have at our works applying to all engines in that place.

Q. This plate and bolt No. 8, I understood you to say was cold?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When it was pulled cold did it make the bolt head take the shape of these bolt heads that are produced here that came out of the engine?

A. No, sir.

Q. Can you show the jury it did not?

[559] A. We couldn't get it out because the threads are destroyed, but it is easy to see that it has not taken any such form.

Q. Could you hold it up and see that it does not take that shape?

A. We could, of course, drive it out there, but we wanted to show it in the sheet just as it was pulled.

Q. After everybody has looked at it, I wish you would have it driven out or drive it out and show how that head looks after it has been pulled?

A. Well, I will do so.

(Here jury examines said bolt.)

Q. How and where were those tests made?

A. In the laboratory of the Baldwin Locomotive Works at Philadelphia.

Q. And they were pulled in the testing machine as you have described?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, did the material of those bolts all come out of this engine, 469?

A. Yes, sir; out of the bolts removed from the crown-sheet of engine 469.

Q. And was that material in this engine put in there when it was constructed and there at the time of the failure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, all of these bolts, as I understand you, that were
[560] pulled cold, broke in the body of the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is all that are here?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you were only able to break them in the head by heating them to a dark red heat or a cherry red heat?

By Mr. Hunt:

That is not what he said.

By Mr. Hall:

I may have him wrong.

By Mr. Hall:

He says they invariably broke.

Q. What did you say in regard to that?

A. I think Mr. Hunt is right; I said they invariably broke, and in these tests that we made they were heated at the head; we of course did not make a test at all temperatures, but all these that were heated broke at the head and those that were not heated broke in the body of the bolt.

Q. Now, describe to the jury how you made those nuts on the end larger and screwed them in with a big wrench until you twisted the thread, why did you do that?

A. We wanted to see if there was a possibility of abusing the bolt head enough to cause it to crack. We also tapped that hole at an angle through the sheet to let the bolt head bear on one side and then we could stick a feeler through on the other side of the head, that was to see if by letting the heat bear on one side it would tend to double it over and develop a crack.

Q. If the bolts had been screwed in so tight in this engine, I mean in this crown-sheet, I mean when it was built, as to injure the head, what would have happened?

A. It could not injure the head by screwing them in so
[561] tight.

Q. Why?

A. Because it would strip the threads in the sheet or on the bolt. I don't know which is stripped, there is only three-eighths of an inch thickness on the sheet and there is only that much bearing at the time it is tightened up and I suppose the thread on the bolt would have stripped because that is a softer metal.

Q. If it had occurred, what would have happened?

A. It would have leaked on test.

Q. In the ordinary size that these heads are made, how much smaller is the head there where it is nicked than the bolt under the head where the threads begin?

A. You mean square on the head?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Square on the head of those bolts was three-quarters of an inch, while that under the head is a trifle over an inch of metal.

Q. And how much is the bolt head nicked there?

A. Considerably at the corner. But it is probably reduced to—well, I don't know. but it is not much, the greatest tendency of that, when it tends to punch it out, like cutting it off with a shears, it will reduce it in area.

Q. In actual practice of screwing these bolt heads in there where do they break when you screw them up as tight as you can with a heavy wrench?

[562] A. They would break square off. What we do is to screw them in as tight as we consider we can get them up, and then take a chisel and nick them and breakthem off. Some railroads do not take them off at all, they leave them on there.

Q. Mr. Slayton, you have examined that crown-sheet, I wish you would please state to the jury whether there are any indentations around those bolt heads in the sheet that were made by the bolt head?

A. There certainly are.

Q. Can they be seen all over the burned area?

A. They are very pronounced.

Q. Could those indentations in that sheet have been made by the bolt heads when it was cold, that is, when it had water on top of it?

A. No, sir; the test here indicates that they could not.

Q. Why couldn't they have been made?

A. Because the metal of the plate is really harder than that bolt, because there wasn't strength enough in the body of the bolt to cause it to be pulled into the metal that way; the other indication is that the body of the bolt is the weakest part of the bolt.

Q. How far is that sheet forced or buckled down from its normal shape when it is in the boiler?

[563] A. Ten and three-quarter inches at the greatest point or greatest depth.

Q. How much force would it take on the area of that sheet that is buckled down in that shape to force it down when it is

cold, with water on top of it?

A. To force it down cold?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. It would take—it figures out something over eight hundred tons.

Q. In other words, if I understand you, in order to buckle that sheet down in the shape it is now, when cold, that is, with water on top of it, it would take eight hundred tons to force over the buckled area?

A. More than that, but that is conservative.

Q. How much is the maximum force exerted on that area under a steam pressure of 185 pounds?

A. 233.8 tons, that is, with 185 pounds pressure to the square inch, taking in the whole area represented by the bolts that have their heads broken off. It would take 467,680 pounds or 233.8 tons.

Q. Is that the maximum force that you can get there by an explosion or otherwise with 185 pounds of pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the sheet cold would take over three times that much pressure to force it in that shape?

A. Yes, sir; taking a most conservative estimate it would take 1,657,845 pounds, or 829 tons.

Q. These bolts that you have tested and given the result of your test before the jury, where do they come from?

A. The support of the crown-sheet of that engine.

[564] Q. What part of it?

A. The part just back of this burned area or scorched area.

Q. Why didn't you take the bolts that were in the scorched area?

A. When the engine came there, after having been damaged, came to Princeton, I told our boiler foreman, Mr. Bowden, to save the bolts removed from that engine. He misunderstood me and several of the bolt heads were not saved; he saved the bolt heads only, and what I wanted was the bolt and bolt heads, and when I found that he did not save the ones that were burned, I found that they had all been used in the blacksmith shop to make chains, they selected the good iron for making chains. At that time our instruction was to cut the sheet across as we did there, and electric weld the seams and save that part of the sheet, from there back to the door-sheet.

Q. You mean forward toward the door, you call it backward?

POOR

A. I am speaking of the back part of the engine extending from that end over there to the door sheet of the engine, but our men did not make a very good job of the electric welder, and we decided to cut out the rest of that sheet, which we did, and at that time I saved these bolts which came out just back of this.

Q. Now, I wish you would take that blue print marked [565] Exhibit D, and point out to the jury where those bolts came from that you used in making the test, on that diagram there showing the crown-sheet.

A. The upper part as I hold it here shows the end of the sheet with a row of rivet holes, smaller rivet holes, nearest to the opening, these solid dots show what you see in the sheet now that had bolts in with the heads popped off.

Q. Was that burned area shown by the solid dots?

A. Yes, sir; and as I said before, the burned area extended down until it touched this row of riveted bolt heads, and was just outside of that line, extending back here, they extended around this a little and back here about three rows, and tapered off gradually that way on account of the curve of the sheet. We cut it off right through here (indicating), intending to make a joint across here and not have to cut out that part of the sheet, as that had not been heated enough to damage it. Then I took some of these, I cannot designate which ones, but some of these bolts here from that line back of these bolts that I have been talking about, and some of them came from one of those lines in here (indicating), they are all button-head bolts of the same size and character.

Q. And were they put in there at the time of the manufacture of the engine?

A. The same time.

Q. Was this sheet No. 9 pulled when hot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it show the indentations of the bolt head around [567] the bolt hole, made when it was pulled hot?

A. Yes.

Q. Does that same indentation around each one of the bolt heads appear there?

A. Yes, sir; only to a greater extent in some cases.

Q. Does that indentation, as far as you can see, in the sheet appear around those bolt holes where it was pulled cold?

A. I cannot see that there is any.

Q. I wish you would have one pulled cold, driven out so that it can be seen.

R COPY

A. Very well.

Q. What did that sheet and the bolt head in the condition you found them in, indicate as to the cause of the failure of this boiler?

A. It indicated that the sheet was hot at the time it came down.

Q. Did it have water on top of it at the time it came down?

A. No, sir.

Q. If it had water on top of it, could it have come down in the way it did?

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Slayton, as I understood Professor Randolph the other day, he said that this boiler sheet could not have gone down; that is caused by heating it or burning it, except at a white heat.

[568] What do you say about that?

A. I cannot agree with that.

Q. Were any of these bolt heads, that you pulled the heads off in the tests you have made, at a white heat when you pulled them?

A. No, sir; not near a white heat.

Q. Did you take a record of the strain on these heads at the time the heads were pulled off when they were hot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What were they in these two cases, the one you pulled when it was at a dark red and the one at a cherry red? What was the strain on the one at a dark red when the head pulled off?

A. 17,900 pounds.

Q. And what was the strain on the one at a cherry red?

A. It was hardly a cherry red, 6900 pounds.

Q. Did you keep track of the time that Mr. Andrews put in while he was running on the engine, from the time you became superintendent of motive power? I mean did he run regularly or not?

A. No, sir; Mr. Andrews laid off considerably.

Q. On what account?

A. I understood—

Q. (Interposing.) Do not say what you understood unless he told you.

A. He reported that he was unable to go out.

[569] Q. It was testified here that Mr. Andrews made from $125.00 or $150.00 a month to $200.00 a month. How much would he have made if he had run regularly on this division and kept his regular run?

A. I couldn't say without checking up the pay roll.

Q. I don't mean to say absolutely accurately, but just give me your general idea.

POOR COPY

COPY BOUND CLOS

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to that question. We do not think he ought to guess at how much he could run; he can check up by the records and show how much Mr. Andrews was off and that will be all right.

By Mr. Hall:

I am asking what an engineer running on this division ordinarily makes.

A. If he made every day in the week, which is the best that could be done, of course, at the rate he was paid, he would get $165.00 a month. Of course, that is the regular rate and without overtime.

Q. Do they get overtime on these runs between Roanoke and Princeton?

A. They get overtime if they are beyond a certain time in making the trip.

Q. How long does it take ordinarily to make a trip?

A. On that division from eight to twelve hours.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. When did you begin to work for the Virginian Railway?

A. December the 9th, 1910.

Q. Were you ever a boilermaker?

A. No, sir.

[570] Q. You never worked on a boiler, that is, regularly, in your life, did you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do about a boiler?

A. I was a helper.

Q. Did you ever study the scientific part of it at college anywhere?

A. I am not a college man; no, sir.

Q. The only experience you have had is just the work you have done during your experience?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that constitutes your learning on the subject, doesn't it?

A. I try to post myself a little.

Q. I understand the learning you have has been acquired in that way; you have never studied the theory of it, and you are not a mechanical engineer?

A. No, sir; I am not a college man.

SE IN CENTER

Q. What is the area of a one and one-eighth inch bolt in figuring the strain on that bolt?

(Witness looks at book.)

Q. Cannot you figure it without that book?

A. It is well to check up. It is almost an inch, 99.4.

Q. Practically an inch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you figure that?

[571] A. The area?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. From the diameter or the circumference.

Q. What would be the circumference there?

A. The circumference?

Q. Yes.

A. 3.1516 or 3.1416.

Q. What would be the diameter?

A. Inch and one-eighth.

Q. Is that measured from the bottom part of the thread or the top part?

A. You asked me one and one-eighth inch bolts?

Q. When you speak of an inch and one-eighth inch bolts, do you mean from the outside of the thread?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then the diameter, you would have to figure that that strength wouldn't be an inch and an eighth?

A. It would depend what part of the thread you are figuring.

Q. You figure the weak end of the thread?

A. That depends where you are figuring, if you would ask me what I figure that bolt—

Q. (Interposing.) You would have to figure from the root of the thread on one side to the root of the thread on the other?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That wouldn't be one and one-eighth, would it?

[572] A. No, sir.

Q. What was the shop number of that piece of metal that was brought here; that is, the shop number of the Baldwin people?

A. What piece of metal?

Q. Of the metal that went into this boiler, the Baldwin shop number?

A. There are two kinds of metal in the boiler.

Q. I am talking about the tests that these gentlemen here testified to?

A. You mean the shop number of the engine?

Q. Don't look at your memorandum. You said you identified it by looking at the engine at the shop.

A. I don't know what metal you are referring to now.

Q. You remember that one or two men were here from the Baldwin Locomotive Works and gave the shop number of some of the tests?

A. That was the shop number of the engine.

Q. What is that shop number?

A. It is different for each engine.

Q. What is the shop number of this engine?

A. I will find it for you in a minute.

Q. I didn't ask you to find it for me. If you don't know, say so. I am just testing your memory; I just want to see if you remember it.

[573] A. There are 108 engines on our road and I do not try to remember the shop numbers of all of them.

Q. Mr. Slayton, what percentage of engines that are now running on the Virginian Railway, that is the average, I won't say right today, but the general average, what percentage of them have buckled down crown-sheets on them while they are in service?

A. By buckled down, do you mean slight pockets between the stay-bolts?

Q. That is what I mean.

A. Engine 473 had a small place about probably ten inches in diameter where there was a slight buckling and the stay-bolts were renewed in that, and the sheet put back in place. It may show some little signs of having been buckled, or may not have gotten out all the buckle in it, when the sheet was heated and put back in place and the bolts put in.

Q. Is that the only one you have got that is buckled?

A. 437 is now in the shop, she had a sheet buckled that way.

Q. That is not in service.

A. She is going in service; she has got a new flue-sheet, but we did not renew the crown-sheet because it is not bad enough to justify it. Engine 448 had some buckling, I don't know how bad that was that was before I came on the road. I do not know of another engine that has her sheet buckled.

[574] Q. Now, in the customary service of all railroads that you have been with, isn't it true that four or five per cent of the engines are in service with buckled crown-sheets?

A. No, sir.

Q. What per cent would you say?

A. As I said, I could only recall three engines on our road.

Q. I am talking about other railroads, you have answered about the Virginian.

A. I was connected with a road for ten years, in charge of the mechanical department, during that time I had two crown-sheets come down similar to this one. They, of course, were renewed. I had one buckled slightly, which it was not necessary to renew the sheet, and of course, there was probably some little buckle left between the stay-bolts after the stay-bolts were renewed.

Q. They are the only ones you remember seeing in service that were buckled?

A. In my experience as an engineer, I never ran an engine with a buckled crown-sheet, in nine years experience.

Q. Then the only engines, as I understand you to say, that you ever saw before you came to the Virginian, that had a buckled crown-sheet on them, were two?

A. Not buckled; I have seen them blown down.

Q. I am talking down a little bit between the stay bolts.

A. As I say, I have been running an engine for nine years, and I never ran one with a buckled sheet.

Q. I mean all the time you have been working, no matter

[575] what you were doing.

A. In my experience on three different railroads, I have given you the history of those three.

Q. That is all you saw, is that what I understand you to say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then it seems that it is possible to fix these crown-sheets that do not stretch so much but what they can screw another bolt in there?

A. They were not buckled to the extent of this one, by any means.

Q. I didn't ask you that. I asked you whether or not the buckling you saw, or the stretching you saw, was so much as to keep it from fitting the bolt?

A. In all cases we had to renew the bolt.

Q. And put another bolt in there?

A. No, sir; we had to tap the hole out and make a special bolt larger after, and then reset it, heat the sheet and put it back in place, and that would have a tendency to close any seam around the bolt.

Q. What do you call that when you do that? What is the parlance used in railroad circles for that?

A. Putting the sheet back.

Q. I mean doing what you said before.

A. Making permanent repairs.

Q. Is it what you call corking?

[576] A. That is a different thing altogether, corking is taking a blunt end chisel, something like a cold chisel, except it is blunt on one end, and you go and upset the metal around and make the metal flow in around in to fill the crack, that is what we do with seams.

Q. You do that when it buckles a little bit?

A. We wouldn't do that with a buckle, that is, if it is to any extent buckled; but we would do that in a mild case.

Q. That Government expert who testified for the Virginian down in North Carolina, says he can do that. Do you disagree with him on that subject?

A. I don't know at all, but we can do that when it is not buckled too much, if it is not bagged enough to make the right fit. You spoke about buckling, there are engines on our road that have had a slight heating that did not buckle, where it was possible to cork the leak.

Q. When you testified down in Roanoke in the Federal Court, wasn't the question asked you about whether any other engine of this same class had been burned out on the yard at Princeton, and didn't you say there that no such thing ever happened?

A. No, not the same class; I said in this lot.

Q. You didn't say anything about this engine having had filings on it when you were asked about it down in Roanoke?

By Mr. Wingfield:

That wasn't asked him in Roanoke.

Witness:

That was handled outside of the court room, I think.

Q. Why is it that you have to wash these engines every ten days, is it bad water?

[577] A. No, we do not have bad water on our main line, but we do have an accumulation of mud, and we wash them frequently on that account.

Q. If the water is good, it is not necessary to wash them except once every thirty days?

A. That depends, sometimes the water is better than at other times. I mean, when I say the water is not bad, I mean it does not have enough scale forming matter in it to make it necessary to wash

very often, but we at times get water that is muddy on account of frequent rains, and we are getting water from streams, and then we get some mud in them, and to avoid an accumulation of mud, we wash them out before it bakes in there and gets hard.

Q. You have to wash them about three times as often as the Government requires on account of bad water?

A. We do not always wash them every ten days, we wash as often as necessary, sometimes oftener than ten days.

Q. Didn't you say you did wash them every ten days?

A. I said about ten days; it depends on conditions altogether.

Q. You say Engineer Massie having to blow up the steam did not indicate any trouble with the crown-sheet, and that it may have been the coal or it may have been poor firing; it may have been that he burned his crown-sheet and knocked out his engine, might it not?

A. No, sir.

[578] Q. That wouldn't cause a delay, he would just go on if he did that?

A. He wouldn't go on at all.

Q. You don't think he would—you know that sometimes engines burn the crown-sheets and they go right on into Princeton or Roanoke with them on their own steam?

A. Sometimes the crown-sheet has been scorched a little, as I said, and it does come in.

Q. That is what I am talking about.

A. But that is very different from burning, Mr. Staples.

Q. I will change it to scorching, then.

A. There has been at times a slight scorching of the engine which was not so bad but what they could come in and did come in and give us an opportunity to fix them up.

Q. You don't know whether Mr. Massie might have discovered he had low water on that engine and knocked the fire out, until it cooled off, or not, do you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You don't know that of your own personal knowledge?

A. No; I wasn't there.

Q. Have you brought Mr. Massie to explain that delay, is he here?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you break in firemen on these regular runs?

A. We usually promote our firemen from positions around the roundhouse and although they have had positions there and get familiar with some of the work, they have to learn the actual work of fir-

ing an engine by actual experience.

Q. You do not break a man in on one of these regular
[579] runs with a great big freight train, do you?

A. That is all the runs we have.

Q. You do not have any runs in the yard?

A. Switch engine service is entirely different and separate from road service.

Q. I thought you said the only engines you had were these engines?

A. I said the only runs we had—

Q. You do not break in green firemen on these runs, do you make that a habit or not?

A. I frequently have to take a man from Roanoke, for instance, who hasn't fired an engine at all, to take a train back to Princeton.

Q. I want you to tell me the name of one man who never had fired an engine before that you put on a regular run.

A. I cannot recall the names, but just the other day the roundhouse clerk came to me and told me that he had to send a green man out from Roanoke on account of the regular man laying off.

Q. They weren't delayed at all?

[580] A. I didn't look it up, but there was no report of any trouble on that account.

Q. Although they had a green fireman?

A. Some green firemen do well and others do not do so well.

Q. You always have a good supply of firemen in Princeton, do you?

A. We usually have.

Q. You don't have to put any green men on at Princeton?

A. We certainly do; we do not have firemen enough to last us always and we have to keep breaking in new men.

Q. But you do not break them in on these runs?

A. There are no other runs to break them in on.

Q. Do you break them in on these runs?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You mean to say you make a regular habit of breaking in your firemen on these runs? Is that what you intend to say?

A. There is no other place to break them in.

Q. Just answer my question.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that all of these bolt heads that were brought here were picked up out of that engine?

A. I know that the nine were handed me by Mr. Bowden be-

fore the last trial or sometime before that, as the bolts that he had picked up out of the ash pan and had in his possession up to
[581] the time he gave them to me. I took them to the trial in Roanoke where they were shown to the jury and after the completion of the trial there, before we left the court room, I boxed the bolts up and I have had them in my possession ever since.

Q. Did you pick those bolts up yourself ?

A. The other three I picked up from the fire box myself.

Q. You picked up three; how about those other nine?

By the Court:

He said that Mr. Bowden gave him those.

Q. Mr. Bowden gave you those?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You do not know where he got them except what he said?

A. That is all.

Q. What was done with them after they were given to you?

A. I kept them in my office after he gave them to me.

Q. Whereabouts in your office?

A. In my desk.

Q. Did you turn them over to somebody to put away for you?

A. No, ,si,r; I put them away myself in my desk.

Q. And the only reference that they have to the fire was, or so far as you know, is what Mr. Bowden told you?

A. Those nine?

[582] Q. Which are the three which you picked up?

A. They are numbers 10, 11 and 12. I saw a good many of them in the fire box at the time I picked those up.

Q. How many did you see that were not distorted?

A. I didn't see any.

Q. All of them were distorted?

A. I didn't see any difference in them. I did not select those three, I simply picked up three.

Q. Are these what you call mutilated heads?

A. They are all more or less mutilated.

Q. You were there at the same time Mr. Williams was?

A. I was in the fire box with him.

Q. Did he see the bolt heads that came out of the fire box there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that the bolts that you had in your office were not

brought down here the last time?

A. To Roanoke?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, sir.

Q. And you say that the bolts that were in your office are Nos. 10, 11 and 12?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean to tell us that this bolt (indicating) was not down at Roanoke?

A. I will have to identify it.

Q. Look at it, this is No. 10, do you mean to say that that was not at Roanoke in the trial at the Federal Court?

A. Yes, sir; it was not there.

[583] Q. There was a bolt down there that had the thread sticking out like that?

A. You have the nine bolts there that were at Roanoke at that trial.

Q. Do you say there was no bolt at Roanoke at the last trial that had thread sticking out like that, and that was twisted around that way?

A. There was one there very similar.

Q. Please find it for us.

A. They are just as they were.

Q. Where is the one you spoke of?

A. You have all there is to be had; there are fourteen with these two that were pulled in the test.

Q. They were not down at Roanoke?

A. No, sir.

Q. These were all that were in Roanoke?

A. I will identify them.

Q. Isn't it a fact that those two bolts that had these things sticking out like this were at Roanoke?

A. No, sir.

Q. Aren't you mistaken about the number of bolts?

A. Not at all.

Q. You say you did not bring any part of the sheet here except what was distorted?

A. No, sir; there is two corners on the sheet that are not distorted.

Q. I mean the balance of the sheet you left at Princeton

[584] and did not bring along with you.

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Slayton, isn't it true that the sudden letting go of a few bolts throws such an additional load on the adjacent ones that they are frequently unable to stand the strain and tear out row by row until the whole crown is blown down?

A. That would apply if it was hot.

Q. Do you think that would only apply where it was hot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You don't think that would apply if it was not hot?

A. No, sir; or if the bolts were not heated.

Q. If there was any defect in the bolt, so as to give it a start, it would apply?

A. It wouldn't apply with a bolt put in as these bolts were put in with a head on them.

Q. What do you think of the practice of allowing a few bolts or stays in the crown-sheet, without any heads on, so that in case of a little low water they will pull through right easy?

A. My first experience with a sheet going down was one that had no button-heads, they were all riveted, and when it blew down, it appeared to me that they stripped too easily, that is, as soon as the sheet got hot, it stripped the sheet over the riveted head, and [585] it appeared to me that it would be better to have button-heads on them. This was an old engine that had been in the service probably twenty years, and at that time, when this happened, it was the practice of most railroads to use some button-head stays. There is a difference of opinion as to what is the best practice; it can be argued either way, and either crown-sheet is safe when it is not heated.

Q. What I mean is this, that there is a practice which was advanced by some mechanical engineers, of having one or two bolts put in the upper end of the crown-sheet without any button-head on it, so that when the crown-sheet got hot that would let it down and act as a sort of low water line alarm, you have heard of that theory?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't it true that that theory failed to work out properly because when one or two of these would let go like that, the whole thing would come down?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't agree with that theory then?

A. No, sir.

Q. You do think and you say that there is no increased strain on the bolts by reason of some of them giving way?

A. I did not say that.

Q. Do you think so or not?

A. There certainly would be.

Q. Isn't it true that the increased strain due to the momentum and the velocity and the pressure, as soon as one or two of those bolts would give way, would be sufficient to start the crown-sheet
[586] down, and distort the heads on the balance of the bolts?

A. No, sir.

Q. You do not think so?

A. I know it would not.

Q. You know it would not?

A. No, sir; if the sheet were cold or at the right temperature, that is, having water on it.

Q. Do you think that those bolt heads were distorted in that shape before the crown-sheet let down?

A. Yes, sir?

Q. You think, then, as I understand it, that that crown-sheet was strong enough and the bolts were strong enough to hold up that whole business while that bagged around in that condition?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And bagged to that extent?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you think that the crown-sheet would hold that way and not give way, do you?

A. It would hold until the pressure on some bolt or bolts was greater than the tensile strength of the iron, under the conditions then existing.

Q. Now, as I understand your theory, if that crown-sheet was in that condition, all of those holes would be so stretched that if water was put on them they would be leaking very badly, wouldn't
[587] they?

A. Not at that time.

Q. Not when it is bagged down like that?

A. Wait a minute, I will explain, if it had been stopped, that is, if the pressure had been relieved before they actually failed, and then put water back on, it would leak like a sieve.

Q. I am talking while in that condition; I am not asking you while in other conditions, but I am asking you while it was stretched out and bagged down in that condition, do you, or not, think that the holes were stretched around the bolts?

A. Yes, sir; the holes were stretched around the bolts.

Q. Do you not think it was a tight fit at that time?

A. Yes, sir; as long as the bolt heads and the sheet were in a plastic state and the pressure on it, it was; I do not mean a tight fit, it was a comparatively tight fit, the pressure would hold it to the head.

Q. Do you think it was a tight enough fit to keep the crown-sheet from leaking with the pressure from the boiler?

A. It no doubt did leak, but it was leaking steam and not water.

Q. I am talking about the conditions if there had been water over it, it would leak water, in your opinion?

A. Yes, sir; it certainly would.

Q. You think each one of those bolts should be leaking all about the same, don't you?

A. They were not all the same, there is a difference in
[588] the temperature in the highest point of the sheet and that on the side.

Q. If that thing had been bagged down enough to stop those bolts in the shape it was before giving way, wouldn't every one of those holes be leaking a whole lot?

A. You say bagged down?

Q. Like you had it on that red thing.

A. I think you have gotten confused between bagging and buckling or pocketing, pocketing is between the bolts, bagging is on the sheet proper.

Q. Here is what I am talking about now. If just before that explosion, as I understand you to say and think was the effect, that crown-sheet was twisted down in that kind of condition with 185 pounds pressure on it, wouldn't it stretch around here, according to your theory, or bag, and every one of those bolts would have to be leaking the same?

A. It would stretch so big that the threads would give no protection in the way of a fit.

Q. It would be bound to leak some?

A. Not necessarily, until the pressure was relieved or the sheet contracted by the water coming in, it no doubt did leak in some places, but it was steam and not water, there was no water there to leak.

Q It leaked steam there, didn't it?

A. It would.

[589] Q. It was bound to do it according to your theory?

A. I do not say it was bound to, but I would judge it would some.

Q. Wouldn't it be bound to if it was stretched in that condition?

A. No doubt it did leak, but the sheet was bearing on the bolt at the time and in a plastic shape, the bolt head and the sheet.

Q. Just state whether or not in your opinion it would leak steam? Do you or not say it was bound to leak steam?

A. I would say I would consider it would leak some steam; yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean to tell the jury here that the crown-sheet could have gotten in that condition like you have got it in that diagram, and that fireman look in that door, just before it went down, and not see any steam leaking?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Sir?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say the crown-sheet, as I understood, was not strong enough to force the bolts into the kind of shape shown here?

A. I said the bolt wasn't strong enough to force itself into the sheet.

Q. That is not what you said.

A. What did I say?

[590] Q. You said the crown-sheet was not strong enough to distort that bolt or mutilate that bolt like it is shown to be here, didn't you?

A. What I meant was that the bolt did not have enough strength in the body of it to pull the head of the bolt in a cold sheet that way without breaking the bolt.

Q. I thought you said the crown-sheet itself was not strong enough. You did say that; I don't know whether you meant to say that or not.

A. I say that again, the sheet is not strong enough either to do that.

Q. Then why did you say just now you did not say that?

A. I do not think it came up in that way; I will say it now, that the sheet is not thick enough.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, did you hear the Baldwin Locomotive men testify yesterday that the crown-sheet and the bolts have the same tensile strength and are able to stand the same kind of strain?

A. Practically the same tensile strength.

Q. And didn't you say here on the witness stand within the last half hour that the sheet is made of a tough steel and the bolts of soft iron?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And yet you tell this jury that the sheet is not strong enough to twist the bolt?

A. It depends on the thickness of the sheet, the tensile strength on the per square inch, and the thickness of the sheet is three-eighths while the bolt is an inch in diameter.

[591] Q. Do you mean to tell this jury that although you told them that this bolt was made out of iron and the sheet out of hard steel, that sheet wasn't strong enough to twist that bolt like you see it here?

A. No, it is not; the sheet might be as thin as tin and have the same tensile strength as the bolt has, but the sheet being so thin it would bend around the bolt.

Q. Didn't you hear the Baldwin men say they were able to stand the same amount of strain and the thickness was made so as to correspond with the strength of the bolt; what would be the reason of having a strong bolt on there if the sheet was weak?

A. The sheet is not weak.

Q. I thought you said it was.

A. No, sir; I did not say that; the sheet is not weak and the bolt is not weak, and it is capable of standing 13.3 times the pressure they are called on to stand, which is certainly factor of safety enough.

Q. Then it is not a tissue paper sheet, is it?

A. No, sir; it is the usual thickness of sheets.

Q. How hot do you think that crown-sheet must have been to go down just from low water?

A. It was pretty hot.

Q. About what color do you reckon it would have been?

A. It was a good bright red at least.

[592] Q. That bolt that you have over there, that was a bright red, held 6900 pounds, didn't it?

A. It wasn't a bright red, that wasn't like a cherry red. The question of red is a matter—in describing the color, it is difficult for one man to see it and just describe it so that another one will understand. One man would call a thing a dull red, when it showed a dull red in a bright sunlight, and it would show redder if you had it in the dark; but that sheet and bolt at the time it was pulled was what I would call a rather dull cherry red, and then there is a bright red and a clear red, from that on to a white heat.

Q. I don't know what you mean by a bright red then, if a cherry red isn't bright. Do you call that a bright red or not?

A. No, sir; I do not call a cherry red bright; that is a degree

between cherry red and bright or clear red.

Q. Do you not think it would have to be white heat to do that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Didn't the bolts you tried there, at a bright red, or whatever it was you had it, stand more than twice the pressure of that boiler in that condition?

A. Yes, twice the pressure what they would have to stand in that position.

Q. At the maximum pressure of the boiler, isn't that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it would have to be heated lots hotter than you

[593] heated it to go down?

A. Not much; they lose their strength very rapidly in those temperatures.

Q. Any way, the bolts ought to have held that sheet while it was so hot when it bent itself around like a snake, like you have got on that diagram?

A. They evidently did.

Q. That is your theory of it, isn't it?

A. My theory is they did until it got somewhere near that contour.

Q. Your theory is that that sheet was hot when it went down and it was twisted into that kind of a wavy shape, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir; it was hotter in parts than it was in others on account of having been exposed to the heat without water on it longer.

Q. You say bolts ought to break in the center if they broke from cold? You mean good, perfect bolts, don't you? If the bolt has got a defective head on it, you wouldn't expect it to break first in the center?

A. That would depend.

Q. I am talking if you had a defective head.

A. If you had no head at all?

Q. Defective sheet too, or defective head?

A. A bolt the size of that screwed into the sheet and with a riveted head to it, would break in the body before it would break in the thread.

Q. That is, if it was a perfect fit?

[594] A. Yes, sir; if it wasn't a perfect fit, it would strip it.

Q. Suppose the bolt head is subjected to a test—

A. (Interposing.) One of these were.

Q. Two of them were, evidently, weren't they?

A. No, sir; I am talking about this that we made the test with.

Q. I am talking about these.

A. Those weren't near the outer edge of the sheet.

Q. They got twisted powerfully, didn't they?

A. Yes, sir; when the sheet went down.

Q. They twisted around that way, and just wrenched their heads off that way (indicating)?

A. Before they were wrenched off they were so hot that they were distorted.

Q. I didn't ask you whether they were hot, I asked you if they were not wrenched as shown by that shape?

A. They are distorted, that is certain.

Q. Wrenched, I said. Do you or not think that the shape of the bolt shows it was wrenched?

A. I don't know what you mean.

Q. One side pulled off before the other side twisted?

A. They are all twisted; one side gave out a little before the other.

Q. That is what I mean.

A. But not until after it was heated and distorted, all over the face of the bolt head.

[595] Q. That looks like the bag went down, and when it went off it just ripped the bolts off sideways all the balance of the way down, doesn't it?

A. No, sir; the sheet was hotter in the center and at the front than it was at any other point, and naturally it would start to go down there first.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, which of these sheets over here was it that you had heated up to that dull red heat?

A. No. 9 was the lowest temperature and No. 7 is the highest.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, this sheet was a dull red heat, I believe (No. 9)?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you see any hole over yonder that has got any kind of a shape in them, any tendency to pull through the sheet like that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Show me one, please, sir.

(Witness goes to crown-sheet and does so.)

Q. Now, I want you to find a hole on here, except where this crown-sheet bends like this, from the level into a curve but along the

POOR COPY

body of this thing, I want you to find one that is pulled in as much as that on the whole crown-sheet.

A. That is pulled in as much at this time?

Q. Anything like as much.

A. Here is the situation, that it was pulled in like that (indicating).

Q. I didn't ask you to explain it. Look and see whether [596] can find one.

A. This was the hottest part of the sheet, and it is not now in the shape this is (indicating).

Q. Can you find any that is in that kind of shape?

A. Not just now, and that is easily explained.

Q. I didn't ask you to explain it.

By Mr. Hall:

Go ahead and explain it.

By Mr. Staples:

You can explain it to Mr. Hall later on.

By Mr. Hall:

I ask that he be allowed to explain it now.

By the Court:

He said he cannot find a hole but he can explain it. You said that was easily explained, now go ahead and explain it.

A. This one here, the one in the upper left hand corner of the crown-sheet, shows pocketing similar to that in the plate, it is in a line of the row of crown-bolt holes to the second one from the flue-sheet, and that bolt did not fail, that is, it did not break clear off, but it was afterwards drilled out, but the pocketing is deepest on the side down toward the next row of stay-bolts which did not fail, and is hardly perceptible on the side toward the flue-sheet, which did not go down, due to the fact that it was so near to the flue-sheet it was supported by that. That gives the best idea of the actual conditions on the sheet previous to the final giving way of the plate, as that did not stretch as did the rest of the plate. This (indicating) was about as cool as any part of the sheet on account of being the last part [597] of the sheet to have been bared of water, and all this (indicating) through the center shows from the print of the bolt on the sheet, the same as shown on the sample, but it also shows that that sheet was blown down which resulted in its being stretched when it straightened out the pockets in the hot sheet, and of course that re-

duced the apparent indentation or the indentation that we have in the square sample, which was not supported by bolts for any distance around it, but was pulled with the plate resting on a support four inches apart at the time and the outer edges permitted to curl up. This sample plate was four inches apart and we were trying to get as near the conditions here, but there was no bolts at these other corners to hold the corners down, it is easily seen here (indicating).

Q. Now, the only hole you could find was one in the corner where the sheet bends?

A. That is at this time, pulled in the shape of the plate.

Q. But you think you can explain why the thing looked different?

A. Certainly.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, if that sheet had been in that sort of a snake-like shape like you have got on that chart, and it went down and straightened out like you say, and it was not at a plastic heat wouldn't it have fractured the sheet or shown signs of a fracture?

A. No, sir.

Q. Wouldn't it necessarily have done it?

[598] A. No, sir; one test of that material is to double it over on itself cold and hammer it right down flat cold.

Q. And bring it back without a fracture?

A. That don't bring it back.

Q. This is bringing it to the snake shape and then bringing it back straight.

A. That is done easily.

Q. The bolts that you made these tests from, did they come from the overheated surface of that crown-sheet?

A. No, sir; I have explained that they did not.

Q. They did not?

A. No, sir.

Q. They came from where the crown-sheet did not go down?

A. Part of that sheet that did not go down was heated, but not to the extent this part was (indicating), as I have explained.

Q. They did not come from any of the defective bolts that gave way?

A. No, sir; and I have explained that.

Q. Then you took for your experiment to prove that they were good bolts, bolts that did not break or give way, didn't you?

A. I took the nearest I could get to it, as I explained; I could not at that time get the bolts that did break. I had given instructions

to keep them, but the foreman misunderstood me and kept the heads, not understanding that I wanted the bolts.

Q. I don't care about your reason, I was asking you if [599] that is not a fact?

A. That is a fact, as I have given it to you.

Q. That is a mighty poor test of whether the bolts that did break were defective, isn't it?

A. Not at all.

Q. You think that an engineer with a hot fire blowing could look in there and see whether this crown-sheet had been previously burned?

A. You will have to describe what you mean by a hot fire; if a man has a fire that has coked, that is, has burned down, and the gases burned off, there is no trouble at all to look in by getting down in a position to look in.

Q. Suppose the gases are there so that you have got to have a torch to look around the smoke and gases?

A. Our coal is what they call smokeless coal.

Q. And there is no need for any torch at all?

A. No, I am not saying that; it does have smoke, and when green coal is put in it will smoke for a certain time, but after it is coked, it does not smoke; if there is no green coal and it is sufficiently coked, you have nothing but a dead fire and it does not present anything to interfere with examining the crown-sheet.

Q. When you heat iron to a white heat, it afterwards presents a pitted or scaly kind of appearance?

A. That depends altogether on the conditions under [600] which it was heated.

Q. I am talking about in the absence of any water.

A. Water isn't all that has to do with it; air has to do with it.

Q. You say there was air there?

A. There is always air there; of course, the amount of air has to be considered. If iron is heated in a blacksmith's forge where the blast comes up against it, it has more of a tendency to pit.

Q. But if it is heated in an engine where the blasts come up against it, it won't make it pit?

A. Yes, if it gets hot enough.

Q. I mean if it gets to a white heat.

A. A white heat, if it gets a little more than a white heat it is melted.

Q. I am talking about as hot as it gets in a blacksmith's shop when it pits?

A. They burn it up then.

Q. I don't want to burn it up, but just enough to make it pit a little.

A. After we get to a welding heat, the next thing, if we do not take it out, we will waste it away, especially if it comes in contact with a blast of air.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, there is a blast of air in these engines all the time nearly?

A. Any blast of air, except up through the stack, creates a vacuum and the air that gets into the fire box has to come through the grate.

Q. What do you call a blower?

[601] A. A blower, it is the same thing, in a small way.

Q. But those two things are bound to keep a steady flow of air on the crown-sheet?

A. We do not use the blower after we are working the engine, but all the air that comes into the fire box except when the door is open, comes up through the grate, through the bed of fire.

Q. That puffing sound that an engine makes, that is made from air going in there and going out, the vacuum?

A. No, sir; it is made from the steam that goes from the cylinder exhaust up through the stack, that is not air, that is steam.

Q. That is what it makes when he draws the air in?

A. That is what we use to create a draft to furnish air for the fire.

Q. That is what I mean. Now, Mr. Slayton, how much does an engineer get an hour?

A. He is paid by the mile.

Q. How much does he get a mile?

A. It depends on what engine he is running.

Q. Say engine 469?

A. I think it is 5½ cents on that class of engine, but I am not sure.

Q. 5½ cents a mile?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far is it from Princeton to Roanoke?

A. I believe it is 97 miles, but they are paid for 100

[602] miles.

Q. Suppose there is a lay-over, do they get any pay for that?

A. Under certain conditions.

Q. What are the conditions?

A. If we have a certain number of men assigned to that division for regular service and on account of the increase in business we put on an extra crew, on account of that extra crew being on, in what we call the pool for a trip, and the regular men are compelled to lay away from their own terminal more than eighteen hours, I think it is, we pay them. It is just a penalty that is put on the company for keeping the men away from their terminal. If there are no extra crews put on they are not paid for any length of time away from home.

Q. There is no extra time put in?

A. If there is no extra crew put into the pool, they are not paid even though they should have to lay away from home any length of time.

Q. Suppose there is a delay on the road?

A. If they are more than at the rate of 11 miles per hour in making the division, they are paid overtime for that.

Q. How many hours is that between Princeton and Roanoke, 11 hours?

A. No, about 9 hours.

Q. If it takes over 9 hours to run from Princeton to Roanoke, they get paid overtime?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much do they get paid overtime?

[603] A. I have not the schedule with me, but it is an increased rate per hour.

Q. You do not recall the amount?

A. No, sir; but I think it is about 60 cents an hour or something like that.

Q. For each hour of overtime that the engineer makes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The engineer makes a whole lot of money on his overtime, a month, doesn't he?

A. Sometimes.

Q. Don't they nearly always do it?

A. It depends on the division they are on, as a rule they do not, on the third division.

Q. The overtime, as I understand, is all over 11 miles to the hour, is that it?

A. Yes, sir.

Court takes a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1914, 2 P. M.—AFTERNOON SESSION.

[604] F. T. Slayton, for defendant, still on the stand.

Continuation of cross-examination by Mr. Staples:

Q. When you were in Roanoke, I believe you told us that the water in that boiler, from the way you figured it out, would not be consumed, that is, if the water glass was an inch from the top, between Singer tank and the point of the accident, if the engine was passing along at a nice rate of speed and not being handled roughly?

A. That was assuming a certain amount of water in the boiler.

Q. Assuming the water glass showed an inch from the top, was the assumption in that case, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; but by looking at the figures or by referring to the prints of that boiler, I find that there is less water in the boiler than you supposed or mentioned or figured there was then.

Q. Suppose you give us the figures so we can check them up?

A. When you take the actual measurement, it figures about 1296 gallons.

Q. What figures 1296 gallons?

A. The volume of water that would be down in the boiler from a point one inch below the top of the water glass to three inches below the crown-sheet, I believe it was figured.

Q. 1296 gallons?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you get those figures?

[605] A. That was gotten by taking a drawing of the boiler and checking against the measurement.

Q. You think there were 1296 gallons of water between a point three inches below the top of the crown-sheet and a point an inch from the top of the water glass?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you figured that much water would be consumed in that much time, in how much time and distance?

A. I didn't figure how much time it would take for that amount of water to—

Q. You figure a difference there of how much?

A. The other was 1550.

Q. That is 250 gallons, isn't it?

A. 254 gallons, but there are other things that were not taken into consideration at that time. I notice the fireman on the engine

claimed the engine was popping off, the engine had a four-inch pop, which consumes 23 gallons of water per minute.

[606] Q. What did you tell us before was the capacity of the injector?

A. 6900 and something, it was very near 7000. That was figured at 180 pounds steam, they do not allow it at 185, and it handles considerably more at 200 pounds, the capacity of the injector was about 700 gallons an hour.

Q. How long do you think that would run at that rate?

By Mr. Hall:

At what rate of speed, Mr. Staples?

By Mr. Staples:

About fifteen to eighteen miles an hour.

A. The engine would consume about 145 gallons per minute.

Q. 145 a minute?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 116 2/3 gallons a minute if the engine was using all the water?

A. Yes, sir; if you used the full capacity of the injector.

Q. If the engine was using all of the water that the injector was putting in, it would not consume more than 116 2/3?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Nobody has refuted the fact that one of those injectors will supply that engine.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And yet you figure 145 gallons and tell us the engine will use that much going along at the rate I suggested?

A. I want to correct that; I had not figured that before,

[607] I had figured the capacity of the boiler, and I see I made a mistake in that.

Q. It is 116 2/3 gallons a minute if he uses every bit of water that the injector will put in it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would give us something by which we can get at the dimensions of the boiler, a blue print or something.

A. I filed with the court at the last trial a drawing of that boiler.

Q. You never did give us anything to show the exact dimensions of the boiler?

A. That is as near as I could do it.

Q. Are your figures accurate or not?

A. We checked them at the Baldwin Locomotive Works, on a large drawing, a working drawing that they used in constructing the engine.

Q. Are the figures that you have given us now different from the ones you gave us in Roanoke?

A. Yes, sir; they are different.

Q. Then since that time you have gotten different figures to work from, haven't you?

A. I got more accurate figures, having access to a large drawing, and a large print, which we did not have ourselves. The builders have large prints to work from in building these engines than we have for our detailed work and shops for repair work.

Q. As a matter of fact, the engine does not, you say, con-
[608] sume all the water the injector puts in?

A. As a rule, they do not require the full capacity of the injector.

Q. So that it would not hardly be fair to say that it would consume 116 2/3 gallons in a minute, running at eighteen miles an hour?

A. We can use that speed as well as any other.

Q. You can use it, but I am talking about the general average that the engineers tell us the engine consumes?

A. As a rule, we would not use the full capacity of the injector, no.

Q. You wouldn't use over one-half of it, would you, of the full capacity of the injector?

A. Oh, yes, sir.

Q. What part of it do you reckon you would use?

A. We would probably work it at seven-eighths of its capacity or something like that.

Q. You think that would be a fair average?

A. I would think so.

Q. Seven-eighths would put it at about 100 a minute, wouldn't it, 100 gallons a minute consumption, it would be about a hundred, wouldn't it?

A. 101½.

Q. Practically 100?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Approximately, that would be as near as we can get
[609] to it, would be about 100 gallons a minute?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if it was running twenty miles an hour and it is 2½ miles from the tank to the point of the accident, that would be about 7½ minutes between the time the fireman looked at it and the time of the explosion?

A. Assuming they were running twenty miles an hour.

Q. As the fireman says.

A. The conductor said he was running eight.

Q. Assuming that he was running eighteen miles or twenty miles an hour, that would be about 7½ minutes, wouldn't it?

A. For what distance?

Q. 2½ miles.

A. At 20 miles an hour would be three minutes to the mile, it would be 7½ minutes, if that is the speed they were making.

Q. If they were running a slower rate of speed they wouldn't use as much water per minute, would they?

A. If they are running at a lower rate of speed it would indicate that they were working the engine harder.

Q. It might indicate that and it might indicate they were [610] drifting down hill?

A. There is no hill to drift down in that distance.

Q. I am talking about generally speaking.

A. You were asking me over a certain piece of road.

Q. You think an engine will be working harder running slow than fast?

A. Yes, sir; usually.

Q. Then assuming it was running twenty miles an hour, as the fireman said, I am asking you to assume the truth of this fact, would it be at all reasonable in your opinion that the water could have been used up in that time even if no injector was put on at all?

A. You ask me—read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. Of course it is easy to figure the amount of water that was used if you know how much they use a minute, and how many minutes there are.

Q. That is an irresistable conclusion, is it not?

A. Yes, sir; that is all there is to that.

Q. Now, will you please pick up those two plate laying at your feet and see if they are the plates which you said were tested and were pulled while they were cold. They are, aren't they?

A. I am looking for the identification mark.

Q. Look at your book and tell us if they are not.

A. No. 6 is one and No. 8 is one.

Q. If you can identify them I would be glad if you would
[611] do it.

A. Yes, sir; those are the plates.

Q. Did you or not, before the noon hour, tell us that in that test it would be impossible, on account of the hardness of the plate and the softness of the bolt head, for the bolt head to make any depression in the plate?

A. Not any depression, I didn't say; I said it would make a depression that was made in the sheet.

Q. Please pick up those sheets and look at the depressions and tell the jury whether or not an indentation has been made there?

A. Of course there is an indentation.

Q. From the bolt head?

A. They were pocketed.

Q. I am speaking not with reference to the pocket but with reference to the indentation or what you told us.

A. There is a mark.

Q. There is a very marked indentation from the bolt head in each one of those plates, isn't there?

A. There is a mark.

Q. It is there?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

I want to let the jury see it.

(Jury examines said plates.)

Q. These are the sheets that were pulled while they were cold. Let the jury see these.

(Jury examines same.)

Q. Now, you gave it as your opinion that there could be
[612] indentation in those plates, and you held it up to try to see under the bolt head to demonstrate to the jury that there was none before they were driven out, didn't you?

A. I tryed to screw them out to find out if there was any and to give the facts.

Q. Your opinion upon that question was inaccurate?

A. There is more indentation in there than I expected to find from pulling them cold.

Q. And to that extent your opinion was inaccurate, wasn't it?

A. To that extent.

Q. Mr. Slayton, where is that snake picture that you had here?

A. Here it is.

Q. The theory that you advanced was that the depression was made in this sheet while it was hot as shown by the contour of those bolt heads, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. There isn't any mistake about that, is there?

A. No, sir.

Q. Those bolt heads were on bolts four inches apart throughout that entire sheet, weren't they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell the jury whether or not the pressure on those bolt heads and each one of them, and on every part of each one of those bolt heads, was equally distributed, assuming that the bolts

[613] were in proper condition?

A. They should be, yes.

Q. There is no question about that, is there?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, then, assuming that to be true, if the depression is the same all around this bolt as it is over on this side and that side, will you please explain to the jury why the contour of that bolt shows a depression only on this side and on that one to correspond with your snake picture?

A. Your question before assumed that the sheet was cold?

Q. No, sir; I am asking when it was hot, as you stated.

A. There is where I misunderstood you, the pressure is equal in that side, whether it is cold where it is black than it is, or when it is properly screwed in as you see, and seated, then the pressure is equal, but if we have got the sheet hotter in one place than it is in another, on one side of the bolt than it is on another, the sheet will naturally pocket more there and that will go down on that side. The sheet is not level, and the water takes a level.

Q. I thought you said there wasn't any water there?

A. The water in the boiler takes a level, therefore the water would bare the highest point first, and that part of the sheet begins to heat and would be the hottest when the sheet finally failed.

Q. All right, that much we have gotten down; are you through?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, will you tell this jury, regardless of whether

[614] there is water on the crown-sheet, how there can be any particular distribution of the pressure on any side of any bolt from the steam which is in the boiler, isn't it equally distributed throughout?

A. It is, when it is normal, but not when it is hot, and when it is hot, if your bolt is located at the upper edge of the heated area, the bolts next to it keep that part of the sheet straight, or if it is next to the flue-sheet the support of that flue-sheet to which it is riveted keeps that section of the sheet straight even though it may be hotter than some other part of the sheet that is further away.

Q. Do I understand you to say that that sheet with the steam pressure on that sheet, is greater at a point one inch or inch and a half, different from another point?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, it is true, that whether there is water on that sheet or not, the pressure downward on that sheet is equally distributed throughout that boiler, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is bound to be true, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

[615] Q. Now then, assuming that the pressure is equally distributed throughout that boiler, how can you account for the contour of the bolt here, and these bolts showing a depression at right angles with the other and not around the entire bolt, unless it is due to the fact of the giving way of the sheet at one end and coming on down with it, can it be explained upon any other theory but that?

A. Easily.

Q. Do it, please.

A. I did do it, I thought.

Q. I am sorry I did not catch it, if you did.

A. There are several conditions there, one is, if that bolt happened to be the one that was in the first row next to the support that it gets from the flue-sheet, this is an upright sheet (indicating) and that supports the sheet even though it is hot, and then there is all the area around the edge where the bolts did not fail and that sheet naturally keeps its contour as originally, or nearly so, and the further you get off from that, the more pocketing there would be, of course.

Q. I have picked up a handful of these bolts and I will ask you if it is not true that those bolts show a more decided depression at right angles, one with the other, than they do the balance of the way around?

A. That bolt?

Q. Examine each one if you desire to do so.

[616] A. There is none of them, or hardly any of them, that are pulled exactly straight, that is exactly straight (indi-

cating).

Q. I say that; that is my idea about it exactly.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't it true that if your bolt strips through the sheet it has got to do it upon the idea that each and every side of that bolt head gives way to allow it to come through that sheet, isn't that true?

A. The bolt head don't go through the sheet.

Q. I know it don't, but I will come to that in a minute. I asked you if it does go through, and you have got something to break up here like a bolt head, and it goes through, it cannot strip on that side and this side and still go through without the bolt, can it, it cannot do that?

A. The head has to come off before it will go through.

Q. Suppose it strips through with the head, the head has to be crumbled up, on either side, hasn't it?

A. That depends.

Q. If it goes through?

A. If the bolt goes through the head has got to come off.

Q. If the head went through—

A. (Interposing.) This did not go through.

By Mr. Hall:

It did not go through.

Q. Now, then, if the pressure from that sheet, which is your steam pressure only?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If your theory is true and that sheet is hot and no
]617] water on it, the only pressure you have got in that sheet is your steam pressure?

A. Yes, sir; that is true.

Q. Isn't that steam pressure distributed equally over that entire sheet and every fractional part of an inch of it?

A. I have said that before.

Q. That is true?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, then, if that pressure drives that sheet down against the bolt until it strikes it here (indicating) and makes these pockets, won't it make a pocket on that side and this side as well as on that side and that one, and doesn't the sheet yonder show that condition?

A. It would do that if the heat was equal all around and if there was no other means of supporting that sheet than the bolts.

Q. Do I understand you to say that around this hole you had a certain degree of heat and here another one, and you had a different

degree of heat around different sides of each hole, is that what you mean?

A. No, sir; I have given you two reasons for it; I do not say there is a different degree of heat around two sides of one hole, but there is something besides that particular bolt to support the sheet.

Q. You say there is?

A. Yes, sir; and the condition of the sheet at the next bolt is so that if the water line was between the row of bolts, which it was, the one that is exposed would get hot while the other one would not.

[618] You cannot heat a sheet all over with water on it, and if there is water on it, it does not matter whether it is a large amount or a small amount, it will keep it from getting heated so as to pocket, and it won't be damaged as long as the water line is there, distinctly drawn as to where the water was, and if this row out here is cold or comparatively cold, the sheet is not going down so much on that side as this side where it is hot. This one has not been exposed to heat as long as the other, if the water has gradually gone down, we are going to the center of the highest point, and when we get to the highest point it would be hotter than it would be towards the edges, that is one reason, and that reason extends clear around the whole sheet. Then on the side next to the flue-sheet there is another support besides the bolt, and this sheet under this condition—

Q. (Interposing.) You mean the side sheet?

A. No, sir; the flue-sheet, it is flanged out and extends out far enough to let the crown-sheet lap over on to it, we have a support to that sheet and it is flanged, and helps to hold up the sheet at that point. That accounts for the rivets not going up there in the lower corner, you will notice that the bolts are just as regular in their location and correspond exactly to where the water line would

[619] come to the level of the boiler, showing that the bolts that did go were all under the heated area and the heated area is just what you would find by letting the water level go down in the boiler, it is just a descriptive line that would be described by the water level beforehand.

Q. In your diagram which you introduced here to the court for its inspection, the bolts which you say gave way on this side, were they anywhere near the side sheet?

A. I cannot say where they were, they were just picked up promiscuously in the grate.

Q. Doesn't your diagram show the entire sheet and show that you have undertaken to demonstrate that, beginning with the center of the sheet?

A. I show one side of the sheet in its normal condition.

Q. Haven't you got the center of the sheet marked on it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Doesn't this line here indicate the center of the sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then this part here and here is not supported by any side sheet, is it?

A. No.

Q. Then the demonstration which you gave to the jury in answer to my question was based upon the support which it would receive from the flue-sheets and the side sheet away off from it, isn't that so?

A. No, here it is.

[620] Q. All right, show me.

A. This is the last button-head radial stay, the water line shows about on a line with this row of bolts, part of the way anyway, down the length of the sheet, it would vary according to the slope of the sheet and the arch, naturally this part of the sheet wouldn't be as hot as the highest part and it is easily seen that this bolt here would get support from this one, this one did not fail, the head did not come off this bolt or it did not pull through the sheet, that one did fail, every one up to the center line shown there did fail, the bolt heads came off and that means that this bolt is supporting in all directions from it, under normal conditions, and would extend half way between this bolt and that one, and then that would support it half of the way and so on. The amount that sheet went down and pocketed would depend on the degree of heat under those conditions, and their heat would not be as great here as there, of course (indicating), because this point is two inches lower than that.

Q. All right. Now, Mr. Slayton, in that diagram which you have drawn, you have a number of bolts and you have likewise given them a corresponding number on that diagram, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have drawn the contour of that outline to fit the contour of the bolts?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have picked out these bolts there as you have

[621] got them numbered, and you say that was the particular place they came from?

A. No, sir; I didn't say that was the particular place they came from.

Q. If it is not, your diagram doesn't show what you intended

it to show?

A. My diagram was intended to show what the condition must have been at the bolt heads submitted at the time they were put in that shape, but I could not say that that bolt head was here or the other one was there.

Q. But yet you have drawn your diagram to fit them.

A. I have drawn that to fit certain bolts.

Q. And for each separate indenture on your sheet?

A. That has to be explained.

Q. It may need a little explanation.

A. I didn't want to draw a picture that I couldn't show I had a bolt to match, therefore I had to attempt to fit each one of those bolts, or be able to show there was a bolt in this lot that had the contour that was shown in that sheet.

Q. Now, isn't it true that in the diagram which you have drawn here for the enlightenment of the jury, that you have drawn that upon the theory that the pressure on the crown-sheet ran with that line and not cross ways?

A. Not at all.

Q. Doesn't your bolts show it?

A. Not at all.

[622] Q. Will you please take this bolt, which is marked No. 4, and place it in your No. 4 hole and see if it don't fit exactly where you have got it there?

A. I cannot do it there.

Q. Haven't you got to turn it part of the way to make it fit?

A. Yes, sir; and I can turn it another way and it won't fit.

Q. If your theory is right, all of the depression was in a line of the snake, as you have it there, and not in a line of the bagging as shown by that crown-sheet?

A. I could have shown another section, this is a cross-section; I could have shown a longitudinal section, that would only have shown a difference in the height of the sheet.

Q. But you wouldn't get the depressions on your bolts to fit it, would you then?

A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. Engine 473 was identical with engine 469, built by the same people, inspected the same way, and under a contract, as No. 469?

A. No. 473, as I stated before, was in the lot built some time later. The general design of the engine is the same; I did not have

the same men there inspecting the engine, and I do not know whether it was the same men at the Baldwin Locomotive Works who inspected them or not, but as a general proposition the engines were the same.

Q. Same type of engine?

[623] A. Same type.

Q. They are supposed at least to go through the same class and degree of inspection, aren't they?

A. They are supposed to.

Q. If the Baldwin people make such good engines, and turn out, as you said, such good engines, why is it that the Virginian Railway Company will see fit to take some of the men from its ranks to superintend its construction?

A. We send men to inspect all important things that are built for the railroad; that is customary for all railroads to do it. We want to know, through our own personal knowledge, we are getting the right material that we pay for and that we are getting the proper workmanship. The Baldwin people themselves have their own inspectors and we have ours. It is the same thing that occurs in everything else that we have built.

Q. Now, I will ask you to please turn to the paper you have and tell me how you identify the Baldwin shop number of that engine with your number, 469?

Q. Now, I ask you to take your paper, from which you say you can identify it, and show the jury how you do it.

A. Engine 469, shop number 37,658.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, if the Baldwin say that their shop number was 1246-1/4-E-28, then they are mistaken, are they?

A. No, sir; that is not their shop number.

[624] Q. I asked you for their shop number; I asked you to identify your number 469 with their shop number; I asked you to show me how you do it—their shop number, that is, their private number that they gave that engine?

A. The shop number I gave you is the shop number they gave us as the number of the boiler that we report to the Government, and that is their serial number of the engine as they build them.

Q. You were called upon by your counsel to identify this engine with their shop number which they gave us here, to show it was the same engine as 469. Now, how did you do that?

A. The material that they put into that boiler, our shop number goes with that identification of theirs, they can explain that better than I can.

Q. But you are the gentleman who was called upon to do it, because they tried to show No. 469 and connect up with it, and they could not do it, and now they are gone. If you cannot show this jury that this material which was tested there under their shop number, as they gave it, as your engine 469, how do you expect the jury to think it was the same engine?

A. Here is the sheet that they filled out for us when they built the engine, shop number 37,658, engine 469.

Q. Now, the shop number of the material which they inspected up there was on a different number, some quarter, and E-28, and it wasn't this number at all. How do you identify this as the

[625] material which they inspected there that went into that particular engine, as being this one, if your numbers depart or deviate that much?

A. They do not deviate; one is their serial number which they gave us as the shop number, and the other is their private mark.

Q. Now, what was their number, what engine was their number for 1246-1/4-E-29? What was their shop number for that?

A. I don't know about 29, I haven't it with me; I have 1246-1/4-E-28.

Q. Where did you get that?

A. I got it from page 20 of their record.

Q. And whether that was for this engine you haven't any way on earth of identifying it?

A. Yes; that was shown on their record as engine 469.

Q. Where is the record of that? That is exactly what I want?

A. That is the Baldwin record; that is not my record.

Re-Examination.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Slayton, does the shop number that the Baldwin people connect up with the private number that you took from their record of this engine 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you copy that from the record that the Baldwin Locomotive Works keeps there?

A. Yes, sir; from two records.

[626] Q. What two records?

A. Two records kept of inspection; page 20 of their record shows engine 469, shop number 37,658, tested with 267 pounds boiler pressure. That was 1246-1/4-E-28.

Q. Have you got that number in connection with the private shop number of the Baldwin people?

A. I may have it, but I am not sure that I have.

Q. You said you got it from two records and you found one.

A. One is the record of the water test and the other is of the fire test.

Q. And do they both show the same shop number and same serial number?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then does that number correspond with your number 469?

A. Yes, sir; I can give the shop number, of course, of all

[627] engines.

Q. We don't want that.

Q. You have been asked about the extent that this crown-sheet was buckled there with heat on it. I wish you would tell the jury whether a crown-sheet buckled in that way, as shown on your diagram there, would leak or not, under pressure?

A. If it had water on it, it would certainly leak.

Q. If it was buckled to the extent this sheet shows it has been buckled between the stay-bolt holes, would it be possible to run that engine with as much burned area as is shown on this sheet?

A. It certainly would not.

Q. Why?

A. Because you couldn't raise steam, you couldn't keep the fire in the engine.

Q. Mr. Staples asked you if the sheet in the condition you have shown it on that diagram there would leak, whether steam would leak through it or not. How long did the sheet remain in that condition in which it left the bolt heads in their final form?

A. It certainly could not have remained in that condi-

[628] tion any length of time; it was evidently heated up and it gave way as soon as it got in that condition.

Q. Did it fail at the time it got in that condition, as shown by your diagram?

A. It evidently did, because that is the extreme position that the bolts got in.

(Witness stands aside.)

[629] N. W. SAMPLE.

N. W. Sample, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Where are you from and what is your line of work?

A. I live at Ardmore, Pennsylvania; that is my home. I am a traveling engineer for the Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Q. Have you been educated as a mechanical engineer?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?

A. The Sheffield Scientific School at Yale.

Q. When did you take your course there?

A. I took my course there—I graduated there in 1902.

Q. What experience have you had in practical work in the line of your profession?

A. I have been with the Baldwin people ever since I graduated. I served a regular apprenticeship in the shop; I was with the department of tests and experiments for about four years, and foreman in one of the departments and their engineer abroad for several years.

Q. Their engineer abroad?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were you acting in that capacity?

A. In Brazil.

Q. Did you take part in the tests that were made of this material that Mr. Slayton has described of these different bolts that were pulled in the test machine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How were those tests conducted?

[630] A. I superintended those tests and we had nine bolts which we experimented with, and we took seven of them and reheated them in the forging shop and we brought them back to Philadelphia, and on some of them we had threads cut and screwed into the plate exactly as Mr. Slayton stated this morning, and those bolts were pulled in our regular testing laboratory in the test machine. Do you want me to go over this in detail?

A. No, I do not think so. Did you try to see if you could pull the heads of those bolts cold?

A. Yes, sir; we tried every way imaginable, on those heads, and heads of that type of bolt in our testing laboratory a good many times during the last ten years, for our information, and we were never able to pull one of those heads off.

Q. Have you ever been able to screw the bolt head in the crown-sheet tight enough to injure it so that you can pull the head off?

A. No, sir; nor in a sheet three times as thick as the crown-sheet.

Q. Have you tried it with a thicker sheet?

A. We tried it with a sheet as thick as the whole width of that thread and never could do it.

Q. What result did you get when you tested it that way?

A. You have got to cut a square on the circular head and the only thing it does is to force the remaining part back upwards and ultimately breaks it off that way, but it never twists the head
[631] off that way, but it never twists the head off at the place where it joins the bolt.

Q. Have you ever seen any bolts broken as these bolts when they were hot, before? I mean the ones you tested; you tested two when you pulled the head, and the heads pulled off in a certain way. Have you ever seen them pull in that same way before when they were hot?

A. Not in testing; no, sir. That is the first experiment that I have any knowledge of, having been conducted at our place.

Q. Did you ever see bolts broken in actual practice down in the head in that way, as those bolts broke when they were pulled hot?

A. Those bolts are the only ones I have seen.

Q. That broke down that way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could that bolt head break off in that way if it was cold?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. If proper pressure were brought to bear upon that bolt, it would break in the body when it was cold.

Q. Why would it break in the body?

A. Because it has less metal there in the body.

Q. Suppose you did break it in the head, would it break down into the bolt or break square off across?

A. It would depend upon the temperature at which it
[632] was heated.

Q. I am speaking of cold now.

A. Cold?

Q. Yes, sir; with water on it, the temperature that it would be with water on it?

A. It would not break there; the bolt heads would not break cold there.

Q. Suppose you did make it enough so it would break there?

A. It would break right even with the surface of the head all

the way across.

Q. Why?

A. Because of the difference in the area, that is the strongest part, that is where the bolt is joined on to the head, and there is nothing to prevent it doing that.

Q. How much greater area has to be broken or disrupted, to tear these bolts out down into the head, as this one is, for instance, than would have had to have been to break it straight across?

A. That would have to disrupt about 30 per cent more.

Q. How can you account for it breaking down in the head in the way that bolt head was broken off?

A. On account of the head being heated, this part here (indicating) at the end is much hotter than the part down here (indicating) and in pulling out it reaches down there, takes hold of that metal and pulls it out, it is clear down here, the heat takes
[633] hold of the metal which is hotter and therefore weaker, and pulls it out here (indicating).

Q. Have you had any experience in examining crown-sheets that were burned?

A. The only experience I have had in examining crown-sheets that have been burned has been three or four that have been returned to our works for examination. We occasionally ask to have them sent back to see how they look, or they are sent back for purposes of replacement, so that we can see them.

Q. Have you examined this sheet since you have been here?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would state to the jury whether or not that sheet was burned and forced in its present shape when it was hot or cold, that is, did it have water on top of it or not?

A. That sheet presents the same appearance as other
[634] sheets I have examined that have been sent back on account of having been burned, without any water on them.

Q. What are the indications that that sheet was burned without any water on it?

A. One of the best indications that I know of is the holes with the threads in them, which are very nearly perfect; they have opened out and then closed up again, opened up to let the head of the bolt out and closed up again, so that those threads are very nearly perfect; that is one indication, and another indication is the absence of any scale or anything on the water side of the sheet.

Q. If that sheet had gone down with water on it, when the engine was in operation, would there be scale on the top part of the

sheet?

A. There certainly would.

Q. What does the color indicate?

A. The color indicates that it has been heated; the blue color on the other side indicates that it has been heated, and the absence of soot and scale indicates it has been heated.

Q. If that sheet had gone down cold, would there be any soot on the other side of the sheet, the fire box side?

A. By this time it would probably—I understand that sheet is about two years old and probably all of the marks would be removed, but I couldn't say about that.

[635] Q. Does the exposure of iron that has been heated to a high temperature to weather conditions and the time that has elapsed have any tendency to change the color or to remove the marks on the part that has been heated? I do not mean put out in the rain, but I mean in the ordinary atmosphere when the sheet is not covered?

A. Most certainly. Take any moist climate, any place along the Atlantic Coast, where it is moist, the color changes very rapidly, whereas the same sheet placed in a dry climate or the western part of our country, it would probably not show the same changes at all. That has been my experience.

Q. Does the length of time that has elapsed since a piece of metal or sheet has been burned, have anything to do with the color and the line of demarcation that will be shown between the part that had water on it and the part that did not?

A. Why certainly.

Q. If that sheet had been pocketed to the extent it shows it was pocketed between those stay-bolt holes, would the sheet have held water under steam pressure of 185 pounds?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. The bolts would all have been loosened up in the holes and the heads probably drawn away to some extent, the heat would have a warping effect on it and loosen up everything and it would leak.

[636] Q. Professor Randolph says that the end of this drum from its appearance ought to leak less than that crown-sheet there from its appearance. Do you agree with him in that?

A. From its present appearance?

Q. Yes; I mean from the buckled appearance between the stay-bolt holes.

A. As it might have been before it blew down?

Q Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir; I agree with him.

Q. The evidence here of the other witnesses is that it pocketed between the stay-bolt holes to the extent of about three-sixteenths of an inch. Do you agree with that?

A. I never measured that.

Q. Just from looking at it, is that a fair estimate you think of the pocketing between the stay-bolt holes?

A. I think it is.

Q. Is this drum pocketed any between the stay-bolt holes, and can you see it by looking at it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Has that end of it been subjected to any heat without water on it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What degree of temperature?

A. About 1800 degrees.

Q. Did that open it up so it leaked?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When it was pocketed that way, did you have the [637] ordinary engine steam pressure on it?

A. I had 185 pounds of pressure on it; yes, sir.

Q. And how long did you leave that pressure on it; I mean to pocket, to what extent?

A. About one-sixteenths of an inch.

Q. That cannot be seen with the natural eye, can it?

A. No, sir; because the contraction of that drum head has probably drawn that back into the level of the sheet.

Q. Are those bolts that are in there, regular stay-bolts, engine stay-bolts, constructed in the same way?

A. Yes, sir; the same size as this.

Q. And put in in the same way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You constructed that drum, didn't you?

A. I understood the sheet would not leak if it had water on it after it had been heated, and I went to work to demonstrate that by making that drum, which I superintended myself. I tried to get as near as possible the actual conditions of the water above the crown-sheet, between the crown-sheet and the roof of the crown-sheet, and also tried to get it as near as possible the condition which

[638] existed on this engine which I understood was the one in question, and I had the drum tested under a water pressure after it was done, so as to make it absolutely tight.

Q. You mean before you heated it?

A. Before any heat was put on it, just as it came out of the shop.

Q. How much water pressure did you put on it?

A. 200. This ought to be shown in connection with this drum—

Q. (Interposing.) Let me ask you first what that is.

A. In order to get the thing clear in the mind of anybody interested.

Q. You tested that with what?

A. That registered there about 200; that is the mark on that steam guage; that photograph was made with this drum full of water, and there were no leaks anywhere in that drum.

Q. Under 200 pounds pressure?

A. 200 pounds water pressure.

Q. And is this a photograph that was taken of it while it was under that pressure, showing the guage?

A. At that pressure, yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you to file that as Exhibit E.

A. Very well, I will do so.

Q. Now, what did you do with the drum after you made that test to show that it was water tight?

A. I then heated that space where the bolt heads are to [639] a cherry red heat, without any water in it; I took the water out of it, made it perfectly dry and then heated it to a cherry red heat. I had a small metallic point connected with an electrical circuit which was one-sixteenths of an inch away from the face of this sheet, and when this sheet first, I had better state that after heating to a cherry red, I turned the boiler pressure in here.

Q. Of 185 pounds?

A. Yes, sir; and this sheet expanded until it touched this point (indicating), at that time completing the electrical circuit and it rang the bell, and I then took the pressure off, as I did not care to blow it there; all I wanted was to demonstrate if it would leak, and if I had left it on another two seconds it probably would have blown through, which I did not want to do.

Q. You forced that out or pocketed it one-sixteenths of an inch between the stay-bolt holes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then what did you do?

A. Then I let it cool down and turned the water in it, put water it it, the ordinary city pressure, which was 45 pounds, and you can see there how badly it leaks just under that pressure.

Q. Under the ordinary city water pressure of 45 pounds?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does this photograph show how that drum leaked?

A. Yes, sir; and if you will compare it with the other
[640] one you can easily see it. All these black streaks down here, that is a perfectly clear surface there, and that leaks as if blotches of ink had run down; that is the water running out at city pressure.

Q. I will ask you to file this photograph showing how it leaked under the ordinary city water pressure of 45 pounds to the square inch, as Exhibit No. F.

A. Very well, I will do so.

Q. Did you put it under any other pressure? I mean, did you put any other pressure on that drum?

A. Yes, sir; we put 185 pounds on there and it leaked very much worse.

Q. With water in it?

A. Yes, sir; 185 pounds water pressure.

Q. Did you take a photograph of it under 185 pounds of pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is this the photograph which shows it under 185 pounds of pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you to file that as Exhibit No. G.

[641] A. I will do so.

Q. Did the water, when you did that, stream out around those stay-bolt holes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, after making that demonstration with that drum, under the conditions that you have described, if that drum had been buckled to the extent of three-sixteenths of an inch between each stay-bolt hole, would it have been possible to have a fire in the fire box of an engine under a crown-sheet buckled to that extent under 185 pounds pressure?

Counsel for plaintiff objected to the question on the ground that the conditions were not the same.

By Mr. Hall:

He stated it was heated under 185 pounds pressure.

By the Court:

Did I understand you to say the first test you made was when you heated this with water on it and got a steam pressure of 185 pounds?

Witness:

No, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

The first test he made he put water in it and put it under a pressure of 200 pounds to see whether it leaked, then he heated it, and in order to make the same conditions exist as existed on the crown-sheet without any water on it or on top of it, he put a boiler pressure there of 185 pounds on it.

By the Court:

What do you mean by a boiler pressure of 185 pounds?

By Mr. Hall:

You used air, didn't you?

Witness:

I used air.

By Mr. Hall:

And regulated the boiler pressure?

Witness:

Yes, sir; with a guage.

By Mr. Hall:

And you left that pressure on until it pocketed between the stay-bolt holes to the extent of one-sixteenth of an inch?

By the Court:

I thought that was the steam pressure.

By Mr. Hall:

No; there is no difference between steam pressure and air pressure.

Witness:

In effect; no, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

One is moist and the other is not.

By Mr. Staples (to witness):

Was the air pressure as moist as the steam?

Witness:

Dry air pressure.

By Mr. Staples:

Air pressure is not moist and steam is, and the other difference is that there is no pressure on the drum when it was heated, but the pressure was put on after it was heated, and then he put the city water in.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. What temperature was the city water?

A. About 60 degrees.

Q. What temperature was the water when you put the 185 pounds of pressure on it?

[642] A. About 50 degrees.

By Mr. Staples:

In one case it is 65 degrees temperature and in the other case it is 185, making a difference in the expansion of the metal. These were essentially different conditions, and I do not think it is proper to draw a comparison between experiments conducted that way and this locomotive.

By the Court:

Q. How much is the diameter of this drum which you have spoken of, on its face, that is now turned to the jury?

A. 30 inches.

Q. The diameter is 30 inches?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How high is that drum from the lower or from the side turned to the jury to the opposite side?

A. 18 inches.

Q. Then it is easy enough to calculate the circumference,

[643] so I will not ask you.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. Read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. I think it would have a very apreciable effect upon the fire.

Q. When this drum was under the test you have described, under the water pressure, could you see the water around, streaming around each bolt head in the heated area?

A. Yes, sir.

[644] Q. Mr. Sample, you have seen those bolt heads that were picked up in the fire box of this engine. I wish you would tell the jury whether or not they could have been forced in that shape and the head rounded off as they are, when they were cold?

A. No, sir; they could not.

Q. Now, the evidence is here that that crown-sheet has been buckled or forced down to the extent of ten and three-quarters inches from its normal position. Now, could that sheet have been forced in that position cold, that is, with water on top of it, by any steam pressure that could be developed by an explosion when the engine was set for 185 pounds pressure? In other words, my question is, could that sheet be forced down in the shape it is when the sheet was cold, by 185 pounds pressure?

A. No, sir; I do not think it could because we have a great deal heavy flanging to do like that at the works, and in order to put that set in a plate of that description or a set anything like it, we have to put the sheet in a flanging press of about a thousand ton capacity.

By Mr. Staples:

We object to an experiment of that kind. He can give his opinion, but not the result of an experiment. It is an entirely different situation and it misleads the jury.

Q. How much pressure does it take to force a sheet of that character into that shape cold? I mean when the sheet is cold?

A. About 800 tons, if it could be done.

[645] Q. Could 800 tons of pressure be exerted on that much of the sheet under 185 pounds of steam pressure?

A. No, sir; you couldn't get over 230 odd tons at that.

Cross-Examination.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You say you tried to pull the heads of these bolts cold; could you do it?

A. I said twist.

Q. Twist them off?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever try it on a head that was cracked?

A. No, sir; I never tried it on a head that was cracked.

Q. Do you reckon that would pull off all right, don't you?

A. If it was cracked half-way, I don't think there would

[646] would be any trouble.

Q. If it was part of the way?

A. Yes, sir; very likely.

Q. You say that the principal reason, or one of the reasons why you think that crown-sheet over there came down from low water was because of the absence of scale; that as soon as it gets hot all the mud scale and everything burns off?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want you to come over there and see if you cannot find a little mud scale on this sheet. See if this is not mud scale all along here (indicating).

A. Right up close to the portion of the sheet which was cooler, there is a small quantity of scale which was probably thicker at the time.

Q. You think this end was the cool end?

A. This side here (indicating).

Q. I am talking about in the center here (indicating), where the bolts have all gone away, right here and all along in there where it did the pulling?

A. Very small quantity happened there, all that adhered to the top which was not heated at all, you couldn't expect it to remove every particle.

Q. That is the highest part of the crown-sheet up there, and gets hot the quickest?

A. That is the highest part.

[647] Q. Is that the hottest part or the coolest?

A. Neither one.

Q. The water gets off the highest part first, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say the reason you made that experiment was because you heard that sheet wouldn't leak after it had been heated and you wanted to try it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who told you it wouldn't leak? Is that what they said around the Baldwin Locomotive Works? Where did you hear that?

A. I heard that had been alleged in the previous trial of this case.

Q. Didn't you say you heard it around there; that one of them

wouldn't leak? That is what you said, that a sheet wouldn't leak that had been heated?

A. I heard it had been alleged it would leak if it had been heated with no pressure on it, and after pressure had been turned into it.

Q. That is not what you said.

A. What I said is in the record.

Q. You said you heard it would not leak and you tried it to see. Why didn't you try it under the same kind of conditions that would exist in a boiler?

A. That is the same condition in effect, substantially, as any engineer will admit.

Q. You think that is the same kind of condition, a flat [648] sheet?

A. For all practical purposes; yes, sir.

Q. You could have gotten an eliptical shape or some sort of a curved circle?

A. Yes, sir; but it would not have affected the experiment in the least.

Q. No man can say what iron will do; he can form the best opinion he can.

A. The curvature of that sheet is practically nothing. That represents a portion of the sheet as well as if it had been curved slightly.

Q. That sheet over there is curved, isn't it?

A. You mean, could I bulge it up?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I could have let it gone more and let it gone all the way through.

Q. When you built your drum you could have put it in a shape like the crown-sheet is instead of being flat?

A. The main arch in that short space there wouldn't warrant your going to the expense of doing it, it would only have been one-sixteenth or one-eighth probably.

Q. You also could fix it so it would not be protected around on all sides by a solid piece of metal that would force it to expand all the way into the center, couldn't you; couldn't you change that and have allowed it to have room to expand, instead of having it concentrated in the center of the drum?

A. That does not expand any more than a boiler sheet would.

Q. Isn't all of it concentrated in the center?

A. No, sir.

Q. Where does it go?

[649] A. The expansion goes out under.

Q. Under what?

A. Under the sheet; only a part of the heat was under the drum.

Q. You heated it right in the middle, didn't you?

A. I heated it all over that end.

Q. This is all enclosed here.

A. I heated it over that whole end.

Q. And it is all enclosed around and locked around, isn't it?

A. Riveted around.

Q. Like that (indicating), so as to enclose it in the center?

A. That does not affect the bulging of it in the least.

Q. You mean to say that enclosing that thing that way doesn't make the pressure all concentrated to the center?

A. I mean to say it does not have anything to do with the effect of the experiment.

Q. Which is the weakest part of it?

A. I don't know that you would have any weak part. It is thoroughly riveted and stayed and one part is as strong as another.

Q. That did not have any pressure on it when you first heated it, did it?

A. No, sir.

Q. You got it up to your heat before you turned in your pressure, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is not like a locomotive, is it?

A. No, sir; it is not.

[650] Q. You also shoved cold water in there, too?

A. After it cooled off absolutely.

Q. At about 60 degrees temperature?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is not like a locomotive, that is fired up, is it?

A. The effect of water going in there is just the same as the water in a locomotive boiler going over the sheet; it is more or less some cooler than water going into that thing at a relatively lower temperature.

Q. When you heat metal it expands?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you heat that thing it not only makes the sheet expand but it makes the bolt expand and tends to fill out any cracks?

A. The bolts will expand some and the sheet will expand some.

Q. The necessary result of that would be the filling up of the little cavities in there, wouldn't it?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Where would all that go, that expansion?

A. One would expand and the other would expand to [651] follow it; there are no cavities to fill up.

Q. But it would fill up any little cavity in there?

A. Cavity where?

Q. Between the bolt heads and sheet, that fits around the bolts?

A. There is no cavity except the thread, and one follows the other.

Q. There is a little hole in there, or something?

A. Not when the end is perfectly tight.

Q. Not when perfectly tight; it is not perfectly tight when it leaks?

A. It leaks when it is hot, after it has been heated only.

Q. I am talking about those pictures that were taken in a temperature of 60 degrees; that is true, isn't it?

Q. If you had heated that to the temperature of the boiler, under the full heat, I say that it would have expanded the head of the bolt and the sheet of your drum, and in that way those two become enlarged and would fit tight, stopping any leak, isn't that true?

A. No, sir; the head of the drum would have expanded and the heads of the bolt would have expanded, and the co-efficiency of the expansion of one is about the same as the other, and you have the same amount of leaking. If the sheet was copper and the heads were steel, it might have that effect, but they are both the same.

Q. If the bolts expand they would get larger, and as the [652] metal expanded they would get smaller?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. The bolts get larger, don't they?

A. One expands and—

Q. (Interposing.) Suppose this has got holes in this here (indicating), when you heat it, do you mean to tell me those holes won't get smaller when that sheet increases in size?

A. Very likely.

Q. Very likely it will?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the bolt heads getting larger, wouldn't that make a tighter fit, if the bolt holes get smaller and the bolt heads get larger?

A. It might make a slight effect on the tightness of that.

Q. Now, what is the temperature of a locomotive boiler at 185?

A. The temperature of the steam?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. About 380, as I remember it.

Q. 380, that is about 320 degrees hotter than you had yours, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You said you saw some sheets up there that went down from low water, sent up to the Baldwin Locomotive Works. How do you know they went down from low water?

A. A matter of common knowledge, the railroad had ad-
[653] mitted it, we sent for it.

Q. This railroad here admits it. Did you ever see a railroad that did not admit that they go down from low water?

A. No, sir; they all do go down from low water.

Q. That is always what they say?

A. That is always what they do.

Q. That is the only proof you have got that those crown-sheets that came up there came down from low water, was the admission of the railroad company?

A. That is all; yes, sir.

Q. Stretching iron removes the scale the same as heat does, doesn't it?

A. It loosens it up and it dries off.

Q. That sheet is certainly stretched?

A. No, sir.

Q. Where is that water line? Didn't you say you saw a water line over there?

A. Yes, sir; very clearly.

Q. Just point it out.

A. It is around where that lighter color is, just about where the belly commences.

Q. If there had been a water mark on that sheet in Roanoke, in February last, it would have been plainer then than it is now, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir; if that sheet has been scuffled around very much, I should say so.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. And it would have been plainer just after the explosion in November, 1912, than it was in February, 1914, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were those locomotives that your company had built
[654] for the railroads that you say that the crown-sheets had gone down?

A. I couldn't say about that; they had sent to us to replace them; they were smaller roads in foreign countries generally.

Q. I wish you would walk over to that sheet and indicate to the jury the low water line on this side of the sheet. It is not necessary for the jury to go there, you can just point it out.

(Witness does so.)

Q. How is that line shown? What indications are there of that low water line?

A. There is no scaled in the burned part, and the part around the edges, the scale is there. I pointed to this mark here (indicating), I wont' say absolutely no scale in certain places, but all the way around here is the burned part, all the way around the bottom here has more or less scale.

Q. You mean there is more or less scale around the edges,
[655] outside the burned area?

A. Yes, sir; practically none on the inside.

Q. If that crown-sheet had been burned prior to the time it started on this trip, would there have been any deposit of soot on the fire box side of it over the burned area, in running twenty miles, with this engine operating?

A. No, sir; it would have burned it all off.

Q. I do not think you understood my question. If the sheet had been burned prior to the time Mr. Andrews took it out on this trip, would the running of the engine and the hauling of a train for a distance of twenty miles have deposited soot on the burned part of the sheet?

A. Providing it had water over it?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was any soot deposited on the edges and the corner of the sheet where it was not burned?

A. I cannot say there is any soot there; that soot has been removed probably by moving the sheet about.

Q. Would the soot be burned off the burned area of the sheet? I mean if the sheet was burned with no water on top of it, would that take the soot off the burned area?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When the sheet first went down, would the line of demarca-

tion between the burned area as shown by the soot be very distinct?

A. I think it would, at the time the boiler was examined, but not now.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. When iron is heated to a real bright red heat, it has a sort of reddish oxidation, doesn't it?

A. It depends on the conditions of heating it.

Q. I mean in the absence of water.

A. After it cools off there is oxide formed.

[656] Q. A reddish oxidation?

A. It may be reddish or bluish red, or it may be blue, it depends on the degree of heat.

Q. When it is heated to an intense heat like a bright red or white, you have a red oxidation, don't you?

A. It may be red or not, most likely it would be red.

Q. And the more intense the heat the redder the oxidation?

A. I cannot say that.

Q. Would you say the reverse?

A. I wouldn't say the reverse; I would have to know the conditions under which the heating was made.

Q. I mean assuming the conditions were the same, that is, in the absence of water.

A. How about the absence of air; it depends on the absence of air and the presence of a larger or smaller quantity of air, what kind of oxide you will get.

Q. I am assuming that is the same.

[657] A. If a piece of iron is put in a blacksmith's forge and heated to a certain degree of redness, you will get a certain color of oxide, if it is heated in the open air to the same degree of redenss you will get another kind of oxide.

Q. What is the difference?

A. The difference is the amount of oxygen that is exposed to the iron and it will be a different color.

Q. Which is the redder?

A. I cannot say.

Q. Where you get the most oxygen?

A. I couldn't say the exact temperatures as to the different colors oxide is formed.

Q. Go to the drum and see if that is not red inside?

A. That is red inside. I know how high that was heated; that is all I know.

Q. Can you find anything like that on that crown-sheet?

A. Not any red like that.

Q. You don't see any reddish color at all?

A. Nothing like that; that was heated in the air, and the crown-sheet was heated inside the engine.

Q. The crown-sheet was heated with a strong draft being blown over it, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Plenty of air?

A. There should have been.

Q. That was not heated beyond a cherry red, as I un-
[658] derstand?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, at a cherry red, what pressure ought those bolts to be able to withstand? How many pounds?

A. At a cherry red the same as that was heated?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Those bolts would stand about 16 per cent of their original strength.

Q. What temperature is a cherry red?

A. Or rather 6 per cent. The temperature of a cherry red is 1800 degrees.

Q. About 6 per cent you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You mean 16 per cent?

A. No, sir; I mean 6 per cent.

Q. Isn't it true that heated to a bright red or a cherry red heat, those bolts will withstand a temperature of from one-fourth to one-fifth of their strength cold?

A. Not to a clear cherry red, the same as that was heated.

Q. Do you deny that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you or not think that a seven-eighths of an inch button-head groove bolt at a cherry red heat will withstand the pressure of 75 hundred pounds?

A. At a cherry red heat?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes; I think it would at a cherry red; but not a clear
[659] cherry red, that is, if you take a cherry red as 1200 degrees; yes, sir.

Q. You draw a distinction between a cherry red and a clear cherry red?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was this a cherry red or a clear cherry red?

A. A clear cherry red, corresponding to 1700 Fahrenheit.

Q. That is near white then?

A. No, sir; that runs up to 2400.

Q. That is about four more?

A. This is 400 less than white heat.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You have been asked about that red oxidization on the head of this drum. What appearance will that present two years from now?

A. I cannot say; but very much different from what it is now. That red oxide will probably be all knocked off there. More than likely it will be quite blue, depending on the condition in which it is kept. If it is out in the air it will probably deteriorate and discolor very quickly. If it is kept inside in a dry place possibly two or three years wouldn't make very much difference, but it will make some.

Q. It will make some?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. You think in two years or so that drum will look like that crown-sheet, won't it?

A. That would only be a guess; but I guarantee it will be different from what it is now.

Q. If the Government inspectors, who examined it a day
[660] or two after the accident, said it was blue, it wasn't the same as that drum?

A. That drum is blue.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. How was that heated?

A. That was heated with an oil torch.

Q. Did you use a blow pipe in heating it or any kind of a bellows?

A. No; a regular oil torch is used in connection with it.

Q. And air forced in?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there, or not, a strong current of air there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does an oil flame oxidize more than an ordinary coal fire?

A. Yes, sir; considerably more.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. It won't oxidize any faster than a coal fire with a blower on it, will it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What makes you think that?

A. Because there is some confinement to the air through coal itself, and there is nothing from an oil torch.

Q. Do you mean to say the air would not have access to [661] that crown-sheet as much as to this?

A. I mean to say in a coal fire the air has more interference coming through the coal and the oil torch flame itself is carried by air.

Q. And you think there is more air than the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And this was just heated with an oil torch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you are testing the holding strength of iron, you place it in clamps, don't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are bound to do that to stretch it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the parting of the iron takes place in the clamp, do you count that test?

A. No, sir; we never count it.

Q. The reason for that is because the holding power of iron would be increased in proportion or as the power of the clamp would increase it?

A. It would make a considerable difference in the result of the test.

Q. I want to ask you if this piece of iron was not parted in the clamp and if it does not show the pressure of the clamp on it?

A. No, sir; that is our inspection number, those are the letters "B. L. W." there.

Q. I don't mean that; I mean here (indicating). Doesn't it show all through that?

A. No, sir; this was not caught in the clamp at all; that [662] is the stretching of the iron and the scale coming off.

Q. That does not show the clamp?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You have got the other end of the bolt, haven't you?

A. It is here somewhere.

Q. Do you know where it was?

A. I think I can identify it by the number. I can find the number on that.

Q. Was that one pulled cold or hot?

A. This is No. 5, pulled cold.

Q. Please see if you can find that?

A. No; it pulled out of the clamp, the clamp only had it as far as these marks; it broke right close to the clamp, but not in the clamp, the clamp stopped up here (indicating).

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. What made these things here (indicating)?

A. That is where the scale and the fibers pulled away.

Q. Was it pulled out of the clamp?

[663] A. The marks took place very close to the clamp in this one, but not in the clamp; it did not break in the clamp, it pulled the fibers away from the clamp, the action being this way, indicating, and broke them on the outside.

Q. Mr. Sample, was this tested under the same conditions that the other was, with a three-inch ring around it, a three-inch ring under this flat surface and around the bolt?

A. What is the number of that one?

Q. How was this end of it held?

A. Yes; that was held in the same way.

Q. How was it that the plates in these cold tests show that they gave way in the center and that don't (indicating)?

A. Because there was a difference in the pulling strain of the iron.

Q. That was weak iron then, was it?

A. What number is that?

By Mr. Hall:

No. 5. Get your record of the test and look at it.

A. Yes, I would like to look at that. (Witness examines record.) That wasn't held in the same way, it was held closer up here (indicating).

Q. It wasn't held in the same way?

A. No, sir.

Q. There was no chance given there for the plates to bend?

A. No; not in that one.

[664] Q. Does your record show how that was held?

A. The records do not show how it was held, but it was not held in the same way.

Q. Is there any mark on it to indicate where it was held? None in the world, is there?

A. There is a mark there that shows; there is where the mark shows (indicating); the washer was of smaller diameter than the other ones were held with; there is the mark right there (indicating).

Q. The pull on that piece of iron wasn't hard enough to make a mark up against this plate to show where it was held, was it?

A. Yes; it shows where it was held; right here, clearly (indicating); right around there, can't you see it?

Q. No, sir; but I will take your word for it; just so it is there.

A. There was a smaller washer on it.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Under what strain did that break?

A. That broke under 42,100 pounds; that was the breaking strain and the tensile strength of that was 53,250.

Q. To the inch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the tensile strength of the other two that were pulled cold?

A. 51,190 for one and 52,900 for the other.

[665] Q. There is practically no difference between the three, is there?

A. That is a little higher than any of the others.

Q. Which one is a little higher?

A. No. 5.

Q. The one that the sheet is not bent at all?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Isn't there a piece of rust in that break? Take a glass and look at it?

A. Yes; that is a piece of rust.

Q. And there is a flaw in that iron?

A. No, sir; there is no flaw in the iron; just a drop of water got in the iron, that is all.

Q. That drop of water hasn't been in there since it was broken?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Put a glass on it and see if it doesn't extend into it?

A. You can only see on the end, you cannot see down in it, you couldn't see down in it without breaking it more.

Q. Do you think that drop of water got on it since?

A. Yes, sir.

(Witness stands aside.)

[666] At this point, the deposition of Robert M. Williams, taken at Tarboro, N. C., on the 28th day of September, 1914, was read to the jury, as follows:

North Caroline,
Edgecombe County:

[667] DEPOSITION OF ROBERT M. WILLIAMS.
(Read to the Jury, October 9, 1914.)

Present: A. P. Staples, Jr., for the plaintiff; G. A.. Wingfield, for the defendant.

Robert M. Williams, being duly sworn and examined, says:

By Mr. Wingfield:

Q. Please state your residence and occupation?

A. Rocky Mount, North Carolina, and I am district inspector of locomotive boilers for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Q. How long have you held that position?

A. Since January 2nd, 1912.

Q. What was your occupation prior to going with them?

A. I was foreman boilermaker at South Rocky Mount.

[668] Q. For how long?

A. About seven years.

Q. And what experience did you have before you were foreman?

A. About twenty years experience.

Q. In your experience as boilermaker and foreman and inspector, have you examined boilers which exploded from low water, as well as other causes?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you make an inspection of the boiler and stay-bolts of engine 469 after the explosion of that engine, which occurred on the Virginian Railway?

A. Yes, sir; I did, with Inspector Pfahler.

Q. When did you make that inspection?

A. Yes, sir.

A. In November, 1912.

Q. Please state in a general way what was the condition of the crown-sheet of the boiler and stay-bolts and other appliances, when you made the inspection.

A. The crown-sheet was partly down, about ten inches I should say, and about 150 or 160 bolts pulled out of the sheet, with the heads off.

Q. In the first place, what was the condition of the bolts, into which the stay-bolts were screwed?

A. Threads were left in the bolts, some were elongated.

Q. Where were the stay-bolts broken?

A. Right under the head.

Q. What was the condition of the crown-sheet where the
[669] bolt heads had been screwed up against them?

A. Considerable pressure of the bolt heads and a slight bag between the bolts.

Q. What was the color of the iron in the crown-sheet?

A. It seemed to be a bluish color, like it had been hot.

Q. In the construction of these stay-bolts, where is the largest part of the bolt?

A. Right under the head and the point that screws into the crown-sheet.

Q. That part that is in the boiler is smaller than the ends?

A. Yes.

Q. When do you think low water occurred with reference to the explosion?

A. Must have been at the time of the explosion.

Q. You have spoken of the bluish color of the crown-sheet. What would that indicate?

A. That it had been heated.

Q. Was there any blue color on the bolts?

A. My recollection is that there was.

Q. At what time did this color indicate that the crown-sheet and bolts were heated?

A. At the time of the explosion.

Q. What did the elongation of the holes indicate?

A. Depression of the sheet.

Q. What did the breaking off of the bolt heads indicate?
[670] A. That they were hot.

Q. At what time?

A. At the time of the failure.

Q. What did the failure of the threads in the sheet to strip indicate?

A. That the sheet was hot.

Q. When the bolts break cool, where do they break?

A. At the weakest part?

Q. Please state how the head of the bolt and that part of the bolt which is threaded and screwed in compares in size with the other portion of the bolt.

A. It is larger.

Q. And when these bolts break under pressure when not heated, where do they break?

A. I cannot say where; they would be more apt to break at the smallest and weakest part.

Q. What did the prints of the bolt heads in the crown-sheet indicate?

A. That the crown-sheet was heated.

Q. At what time?

A. At the time the bolts failed.

Q. Was there any mutilation of the bolt heads themselves?

A. Not that I saw.

Q. Were any of them out of shape?

A. Not that I saw.

Q. Now, if that engine had been overheated—

[671] Q. Assuming that the crown-sheet had been heated sufficiently to cause the boiler to give away in the manner in which it did give away on this occasion, could the engine have hauled a train of 80 empty coal cars for a distance of approximately 20 miles before giving away?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Is it possible for an engine to have been heated as indicated by the last question and run for a distance of 20 miles without giving to the train crew indications of its condition?

A. I don't think so.

Q. What would have been the effect produced by heating the engine sufficiently to have caused it to give away in the manner in which it did and then allow it to cool off and attempt to haul a train with it?

A. I don't think they could have gotten any service out of it. It would have leaked.

Q. Could there have been any water on the crown-sheet at the time it gave away?

A. No.

Q. Did you examine the injectors that were on the engine?

A. Yes.

Q. In what condition did you find them?

A. Good.

Q. Were they in proper working order?

A. Yes; they worked all right.

Q. The valves to pipes leading to them were open?

[672] A. Yes, sir; free from obstruction.

Q. To what test did you put them?

A. I put them on another locomotive and tried them with different pressures of steam, under three different pressures, from less than one hundred up to 185.

Q. Were those three pressures at which you tried them, working pressures? Were they injectors of approved pattern?

A. They were standard injectors and in common use, I understand.

Q. Did you examine the guage cocks?

A. Yes.

Q. In what condition did you find them?

A. In good condition.

Q. Did you examine the water glass?

A. Yes.

Q. In what condition did you find it?

A. Good.

Q. What examination did you make of it?

A. Removed the glass and fittings from the boiler and blew through the cocks and removed the stems to see if they were clean.

Q. What was the condition of the entire engine?

A. Good.

Q. Suppose this engine had been overheated at Roanoke, but not enough to cause the engine to leak, would the engine have been weakened?

A. I don't think so.

[673] Q. Could the fracture in the stay-bolts have been caused by twisting the bolts too tightly into the boiler?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Please give your reasons.

A. I don't think it would be possible to twist a bolt that size in putting it in.

Q. Does your business as Interstate Commerce inspector cause you to be familiar with the character of engines used by the various

railroads in this section of the country?

A. Yes.

Q. You are constantly examining them?

A. Yes.

Q. Do they have in them, that is the modern engines, what is called soft plugs?

A. Not those in service in this section of the country.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples, for Plaintiff:

Q. Where was your first training received in connection with boiler work?

A. With the B. & O. railroad, in Piedmont, West Virginia.

Q. How long did you work for them?

A. About ten or eleven years.

Q. What were the titles of the positions you held?

A. First I was an apprentice, then a boilermaker.

[674] Q. Did you go through the regular apprentice course?

A. Yes.

Q. How long were you boilermaker for the B. & O.?

A. For six or seven years.

Q. Then you went from there?

A. To Elkins, West Virginia.

Q. With what company?

A. West Virginia Central. I was there six years.

Q. What was your position there?

A. I was boilermaker.

Q. Where did you go from there?

A. To South Rocky Mount.

Q. With the A. C. L.?

A. Yes.

Q. And your position was partly boilermaker and partly foreman of the boilermakers?

A. Yes.

Q. You have never had any technical training except what you have gotten in actual experience?

A. No.

Q. It has come within the line of your work to study the strain that the bolts can stand, has it not, and the different kinds of pressure on different heats?

A. I have never studied that. I have had occasion to look it

up, though.

Q. Are you familiar with the publication called the "Transactions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers"?

A. No.

[675] Q. I have here the transactions of that society, which was published in 1897, and they show certain experiments that were conducted with reference to determining the strain that stay-bolts were able to stand. What was the character of the bolt on this engine?

A. I think it was what we call an inch and an eighth bolt.

Q. Was there a groove below the head?

A. I don't think so; I don't remember.

Q. Do you know whether it was countersunk or not?

A. No.

Q. Then there must have been a groove?

A. Yes; I suppose so. I don't remember.

Q. He has a class of experiments recorded here, in which bolts of that character are shown to sustain a pressure of something like 27,000 pounds. Is that in accordance with your information on the subject?

A. I have several times seen different figures given by different people.

Q. That is generally accepted, as to the pressure they can withstand?

A. Something like that.

Q. He also says here, that when these bolts are heated to a dull red, that the pressure is reduced about one-half. Is that in accordance with your experience?

A. I can't tell anything about that. It makes them softer the hotter they get.

[676] Q. He has shown here, that when the bolts are heated to a bright red heat, bolts of this character with the button head, that it will withstand a pressure of something like 8,766 pounds. Do you not think that correct?

A. I don't know. I can't answer it positively.

Q. Are you informed on the subject?

A. Not as to what a bolt will stand in different degrees of heat.

Q. Do you mean you have no idea about that? If you have any information on the subject, as to what pressure a bright red heated bolt of this character will withstand, I wish you would tell us.

A. I can't carry that information on my head.

Q. You don't know, then, how hot that boiler would have to be, if the bolts were in good condition, at a pressure of 185 pounds, for it to go down?

A. No.

Q. You have no idea in the world?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think it would go down, if the bolts were all in good condition, under a dull red heat?

A. I think it would.

Q. You think, then, that a crown-sheet of the character used in that locomotive, and with button-head bolts, would go down at a dull red heat?

A. Yes; with no water on it.

Q. The author of these experiments says that one of the most notable features, is the comparative slight degree of etc. (reading from page 995 of the work which has been referred to). Do you think that correct, or not?

A. I don't know.

[[677] Q. You have observed the look or iron which has been subjected to heat?

A. Yes.

Q. When it is heated a dull red and cools off, what is the appearance of the iron?

A. It has a bluish appearance.

Q. When it is heated to a bright red and cools off, what is its appearance?

A. It would be a little lighter blue.

Q. And when it is heated to a white heat and cools off, what color would it be?

A. I don't know what color it would be. I couldn't answer that.

Q. Would you, or would you not, expect to find that that side of the crown-sheet which had been next to the fire and heated to a white heat, would have a fluky appearance, like any iron that has been very hot?

A. This one didn't have that appearance.

Q. Then, in your opinion, it was not heated to a white heat?

A. No.

Q. If it had been, it would have presented a scaly appearance?

A. I think it would have been a little more rough.

[678] Q. What was the pressure on each one of these bolts,

when the boiler was to the popping-off point?

A. 185 pounds, and I think the bolts were spaced 4x4, and 16x185, that is 2,960 pounds.

Q. Then, the maximum pressure of the boiler on each of the bolts, is 2,960 pounds?

A. According to that calculation.

Q. You say there was a slight bagging in between the crown-bolts?

A. Yes.

Q. It was very slight?

A. Yes.

Q. It was not as much as you would have expected if the crown-sheet was heated to a good hot heat, anything like a white heat?

A. I don't think it would have gotten much hotter before it failed.

Q. Which side of the crown-sheet, to the right or left of the engineer, was the bulge?

A. On both sides of the crown-sheet. One side may have been more than the other.

Q. Do you recall which side was further over?

A. No.

Q. When the bolts are in good condition and three or four of them give away sufficiently to start the crown-sheet to going, that adds an increase of pressure on the other bolts and adds to the momentum which the sheet gets from starting to give. Isn't that true?

A. The pressure would decrease, too.

[679] Q. If enough of it gives away to cause the crown-sheet to give, it subjects the balance of the bolts to an increased pressure?

A. I don't think so, since, as soon as the pressure escapes, the pressure on the boiler would decrease.

Q. This author says, on page 998 of this work, that the strain of the letting go of a few bolts, throws such a pressure on the others, etc. Do you think that correct?

A. Not unless the heads were hot.

Q. I mean, the increased strain on the bolts?

A. It may be a little increased strain on the adjacent bolts. But the bolts on the back would not, unless the boiler pressure is increased.

Q. Isn't it true that the beginning of motion, in cases of that kind, causes a sort of leverage on the balance of the bolts adjacent, so

as to cause them to give away?

A. Yes, on the ones adjacent, but not on the back ones.

Q. And the more that give away, the stronger the pull is?

A. Yes, but the pressure is escaping, too.

Q. The action of steam is very quick?

A. Yes.

Q. I understand you to stay that the fact of that little ring being in the crown-sheet, under the button-head, would necessarily show that it was hot at the time of the giving away of the sheet. Is that your opinion?

A. I think it would show that the sheet was hot.

[680] Q. I show you here some illustrations of drawings made from the experiments to which I have referred, in some of which pressure on the bolts was exerted hot and some others cold, and ask you to state whether it does not say that in all of the cases the crown-sheet was very much distorted, when hot as well as cold?

A. The pressure exerts a tendency on the bolts to pull.

Q. Do not these drawings show that the evidence of that tendency was shown at the holes where the bolts are inserted, and also that the crown-sheet is distorted when it is cold as well as when it is hot?

A. Yes; if sufficient pressure is exerted.

Q. If defective bolts were to break, there would not be sufficient pressure to cause very great sagging?

A. Not one bolt.

Q. But the balance of the bolts would cause a depression?

A. I think so.

Q. Then, if the crown-sheet comes down, due to a defective bolt, or three or four defective bolts, close enough to one another to cause the explosion, increased pressure on the adjacent bolts would be sufficient to more or less distort the crown-sheet as they give away?

A. I don't think it would unless they were hot.

[681] Q. If they were good bolts and sufficient strain was imposed to make them break, would not that cause a depression?

A. Yes; if there was sufficient pressure, but I am speaking of ordinary working pressure.

Q. How many accidents or explosions have you ever examined since you have been with the government? Since that time?

A. I think about eight.

Q. How many of those did you report as in your opinion being caused by low water?

A. All of them.

Q. Have you ever seen an explosion which, in your opinion, was not caused by low water?

A. I had reference to the crown-sheet failures that caused explosions.

Q. Have you ever seen a crown-sheet failure that you didn't attribute it to low water?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the cause of that?

A. Not sufficiently braced.

Q. What was the matter?

A. Not a sufficient number of braces. It was stayed by crown bars.

Q. Then you never have known of any modern boilers to go down that you didn't think it was due to low water?

A. No.

[682] Q. And there is a general tendency, when a crown-sheet goes down, to attribute it to low water?

A. Not without making an examination.

Q. I want to know whether or not it is a fact that a large percent of the engines now in service have crown-sheets on them which have been overheated?

A. Not in this section of the country.

Q. Have you ever seen a locomotive with a crown-sheet that had been overheated?

A. Yes; I have seen several.

Q. How do you know it had been overheated?

A. Bagging between the bolts and bolts leaking.

Q. Have you seen one that was overheated and the bolts did not leak?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever seen any overheated and the bolts were corked?

A. Yes.

Q. Did that still present the same bagging appearance?

A. Yes.

Q. So far as you know, this crown-sheet may have been previously overheated?

A. I don't think so. All of the bolts we found did not present an appearance of being corked.

Q. How many bolts did you find?

A. We found several. We missed a good many of them, prob-

ably as many as nine-tenths.

Q. That is the only reason you have for saying they [683] never had been corked, because those you saw had not been?

A. None of them left in were corked.

Q. The bolts left in were the ones in the lower part of the crown-sheet and the ones less apt to be affected by low water?

A. Yes.

Q. What ones you would least expect to be corked in were not corked?

A. Yes.

Q. What are the advantages of button-head bolts, if any?

A. Some think them stronger and safer.

Q. Why?

A. There is more metal. There is thread to hold, besides the button-head.

Q. What are some of the disadvantages?

A. They draw a little more heat to that particular spot.

Q. What about the advantage of having them, in the construction of the boiler?

A. They are a little more expensive and a little more difficult to fit.

Q. What different procedure is used in fitting a button-head bolt, from any other kind of stay?

A. The button-head bolt is usually turned on a machine and screwed into the sheet from the fire box side. The ordinary bolt is only a straight piece of iron, cut on a bolt cutter, and screwed from the outside.

Q. What steps, if any, are taken, to fit the button-head [684] bolts against the crown-sheet?

A. Just turned in, until it is screwed in.

Q. That is all you know that is done in order to properly adjust a button-head bolt?

A. That is all I know of.

Q. Did you notice, from an examination of this crown-sheet, whether or not anything had been done, besides what you have said, to fit the button-head bolt to the crown-sheet on this engine?

A. I did not.

Q. You didn't see any evidence of anything else having been done?

A. No.

Q. You didn't notice that any part of the crown-sheet was cut away around the bolt head?

A. I didn't notice it.

Q. Well, that is right important, isn't it?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Isn't it true that unless your surface of the crown-sheet is perpendicular to the bolt, that there will be a strain one side more than the other?

A. If your bolts don't come up square, there may be.

Q. Isn't it necessary to shave off the surface of the crown-sheet around each bolt?

A. I have never seen anybody do it.

Q. The same author, at page 994, says: "The chief ob-
[685] jection to button-head bolts is the liability," etc. What do you know of any such practice as that?

A. I have heard of it, but never saw it done.

Q. Isn't it true that if the bolt is not perpendicular there will be a strain on one side that will cause it to twist?

A. Not if the threads were a good fit in the hole.

Q. That button-head bolt is much stronger than a bolt with no head on it?

A. Yes.

Q. Isn't it true that if it is not screwed in perpendicularly, the whole power of the bolt will be weakened?

A. Not if the threads is a good tight fit. Not unless the threads were a loose fit.

Q. What is the use of having a head?

A. Additional strength, in case the threads are a bad fit.

Q. In case one of these screws had weak threads, there would be a strain and probably the head would come off?

A. It would be a bad strain on the bolt head.

Q. When you observed this crown-sheet, you observed that the original scales left by the rolling process were on the sheet?

A. I can't answer that.

Q. Don't you know what that is?

A. I don't know that there were any scales on it.

[686] Q. Don't you know whether it had been materially changed from its condition when it left the rolling process?

A. I don't think it had.

Q. Isn't it true that when a perfect bolt in a crown-sheet is subjected to sufficient pressure to cause it to give away, whether hot or cold, it will, more or less, leave evidence on the crown-sheet, of a tendency to pull through?

A. I think it would.

Q. Because the holding power of the crown-sheet and the bolt are about the same?

A. Yes.

Q. But if a defective bolt gives away, then that perpendicular bolt would not leave much mark on the crown-sheet, if the head came off?

A. If it gave away inside, the head would remain in the sheet.

Q. If the head pulls off, it doesn't leave much mark on the crown-sheet?

A. I don't suppose so, if it was defective.

Q. When metal gets hot it expands?

A. Yes.

Q. But you can heat a crown-sheet without any water and not much pressure and not injure it, provided the bolts are properly adjusted?

A. Possibly, but the bolts would leak a little.

Q. You would not expect to find a leak, if they were properly adjusted?

A. No.

[687] Q. But, if one of the bolts was improperly adjusted, and it was heated, that would twist that bolt and possibly break it?

A. It might make it leak.

Q. It would break it too, would it not?

A. No, not always.

Q. It is perfectly possible for an engine to run along with ordinary pressure, with no heads on the bolts at all?

A. Yes.

Q. What reason do you give why this could only have been caused by low water, if any, or do you not think it was possible for it to have been caused from a defective bolt?

A. I don't think it was possible.

Q. Why?

A. The bolts were of sufficient strength to hold the crown-sheet up and one defective bolt would not cause the crown-sheet to come down. If they were all defective it would give away, I suppose.

Q. What about two or three being defective?

A. I don't think it would give away.

Q. Are you familiar with the requirements of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

A. Yes.

Q. What does that require? How many is the maximum number of stay-bolts, within close proximity to one another, they will

allow an engine to run with?

A. Three within a circle of five feet in diameter, two ad-
[688] joining, or five within the entire boiler.

Q. Then, if there were more than five, they would not allow it to be run?

A. No.

Q. Well, if it is not possible for it to break down from five defective bolts, why would they make such a foolish rule?

A. They want a margin of safety.

Q. Do you think it would be possible for it to break with three adjacent bolts?

A. Not in the condition that crown-sheet was in. There would be too much support from the other bolts.

Q. But if you inspected it you would have to put it out of service, because, under the rule, it was not safe?

A. Yes.

Q. You don't think it would be possible for three or four defective bolts to have been in the boiler in close proximity?

A. It could have been, but whether it was or not I do not know.

Q. You can't tell whether it occurred from defective bolts, or low water, can you?

A. From the inspection we made, we are satisfied it was from low water.

Q. You have not given me any reason why that boiler could not present the same appearance, if it was caused from defective bolts.

A. The sheet would not have the appearance it does.
[689] The color would not be the same and the threads wouldn't be in the same hole and they, if it was defective bolts, there might have been defects in the head or in the boiler, and if they were defective in the boiler they would still be in the boiler.

Q. If the defective head gave away, what would you expect?

A. I would not expect to find them clean and clear, as they were.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. Nothing sticking in between the threads.

Q. None of the threads broken?

A. I don't think so.

Q. If they were broken, then that indicates there must have been a defective bolt?

A. Not necessarily. There might not have been any threads.

Q. There was either a defect in the bolt, or in the crown-sheet?

A. No, I didn't say so.

Q. Didn't you say that there was either a defective bolt, or because there was no threads in the crown-sheet?

A. I didn't say that.

A. If the boiler had been subjected to slight overheating prior to the time of the failure and any leak had been corked up, would it not have presented the same appearance?

A. I don't think so.

[690] Q. In what respect?

A. It would not have been of a fresh appearance.

Q. Suppose it occurred a day or so before?

A. The smoke and gas would have obliterated anything except the depression in the sheet, every possible sign.

Q. How does smoke get inside the boiler?

A. It gets in the fire box, not the boiler.

Q. How about the inside of it?

A. The scale and water formation inside the boiler would have hidden it.

Q. Then, the only reason why you think that there was difference between the appearance on the crown-sheet, as it was when you saw it, and as it would have been if it had been previously burned, was that you think the marks of a previous burning would have been obliterated?

A. Yes, that was what I said.

Q. Suppose the burning had occurred before leaving Roanoke, at a very low pressure, do you think the signs would have been obliterated?

A. It would not have been possible for them to get so far as that.

Q. Why?

A. The boiler would have leaked too bad.

Q. That is your opinion?

A. Yes.

[691] Q. That is the only reason you have?

A. Yes.

Q. If you have any others, give them to me.

A. That is all I have.

Q. That is the only reason you think it was caused by low water?

A. Yes; the appearance of the sheet.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION.

Q. What is the most common cause of these failures?

A. Low water.

Q. When the boiler is overheated does it injure the strength of the metal?

A. I would not think so.

Q. Did you ever investigate any other boiler explosion, where the engine exploded under the charge of Andrews?

A. I would not like to say about that.

Q. Was it A. W. Andrews?

A. I can't say about that.

Q. Mr. Staples has asked you some questions about the increased pressure on the boiler when two stay-bolts give away. You said the pressure would not be increased much because the steam would escape through the holes?

A. I said I thought possibly the pressure on the adjacent bolts might be increased, but not on the back ones.

Q. What would be the effect upon the boiler pressure?

[692] A. I think it would decrease the boiler pressure as soon as it began to escape.

Q. If three or four bolts near together were defective, it would not bag between these defective bolts, would it? It would make one big bag, wouldn't it?

A. I think so. The heads would have to hold to make it bag between the bolts.

Q. As a matter of fact, the crown-sheet has a very much harder metal than the stay-bolts, so that the stay-bolts, unless the crown-sheet was hot, would make no impression on the sheet?

A. It might do it under very severe strain.

The evidence of F. P. Pfahler read to the jury on October 9th, 1914.

[693] F. P. PFAHLER.

F. P. Pfahler, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Pfahler, what are your initials?

A. F. P.

Q. Did you make an inspection of engine 469 on the Virginian Railway after the explosion which occurred to that engine?

A. Yes, sir; in company with Inspector Williams.

Q. When did you make that inspection?

A. On the Saturday and Sunday following the accident, which days, I think, were the 16th and 17th of November.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Are you one of the Government inspectors?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Q. Did you make a report of your inspection of this particular engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I see this says something about a chief inspector. Mr. Pfahler, are you the chief inspector?

A. No, sir; I am a district inspector.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Pfahler, have you examined your report recently?

A. Yes, sir; my note book only.

Q. Upon which your report was based?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had to do that to refresh your mind, I imagine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And without which of course you could not remember this case?

[694] A. Not the small dimensions, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. I will now ask you to answer the question which I propounded to you when objection was made, which question will be read to you by the stenographer (the question is read as follows): "Q. What did that inspection show in reference to the condition of the crown-sheet?"

A. That it was damaged by overheating.

Q. What experience have you had in the inspection of boilers and in work in machine shops and doing work of boilermaker?

A. I have had twelve continuous years in railroad work. That is, I mean, in mechanical lines. I have never been a boilermaker, but I have been a draftsman, foreman; I have had several years experience as mechanical engineer, and since the 1st of November, 1911, a boiler inspector for the Government.

Q. Has your experience in the various lines of work you [695] have followed, enabled you to be able to say what the condi-

tion of a crown-sheet shows, or indicates, as to whether it has been heated with water on it or not?

A. I think so, sir.

Q. Have you examined that crown-sheet since it has been brought here?

A. For a minute, at noon today, after the court recessed.

Q. What is the size of the burned area on that crown-sheet?

A. I couldn't say exactly.

By the Court:

If you will state it approximately it will do, I imagine, for either side.

A. I think, but I am not exactly sure, that my examination showed the overheated area to extend on each side between the sixth and seventh rows of bolts from the flue-sheet, and from there to between the sixteenth and seventeenth rows of bolts from the flue-sheet.

By the Court:

Can you put that in feet and inches?

Witness:

Well, the bolts are spaced approximately 4x4 inches, and that would be about 48 inches by, say, 68 inches, or 4 feet by 5 feet and 8 inches.

Q. Could that crown-sheet have been burned so as to present the appearance that it did when you inspected it and that it now presents, if it had had water on top of it?

A. No, sir.

[696] Q. What are the indications on that crown-sheet showing that it was heated to this excessive heat without any water on it?

A. There are a number. First, there is the color, and the color of heated metal is characteristic. I mean by that, that its color is easily told. The bolts themselves were heated. And this color line ran up on the bolts on top of the crown-sheet for several inches. The sheet itself was soft, brought nearly to a plastic state; and there were plainly defined prints of bolt heads in many places on the inside or fire side of the sheet.

Q. Are the holes enlarged, or do they show their true size, as they did when the crown-sheet was in shape?

A. No, sir; some of them are elongated.

Q. Could they have been given that shape in any other way

than by the crown-sheet being heated and under this pressure?

A. No, not to my knowledge, sir.

Q. Are there any pockets in the sheet between those bolt holes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do they indicate?

A. That the sheet was soft, and that it bagged between the bolts prior to the final rupture.

Q. Could there have been any water on the top of this sheet covering the burned area and the sheet have been forced into the condition that you have described?

A. I don't think so, sir.

[697] Q. If this sheet had been burned so as to be in the condition it now is, could that engine have hauled the train from Roanoke, a distance of 20 miles west of here?

A. I think not, sir. It would have leaked very badly.

Q. Why would it have leaked?

A. Because of the action of the heat, the intense heat such as the sheet was subject to, would have enlarged the holes in the sheet, tending to destroy the nice fit between the thread of the bolts and the thread of the sheet, and water would have escaped.

Q. Did you examine the injectors that were on this engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What tests did you put them to?

A. We moved them onto locomotive 468, a locomotive of exactly the same class, and tried them under varying steam pressures.

Q. How did they work?

A. Satisfactorily, first-class, at steam pressures of 100, 150 and 180 pounds.

Q. Are you familiar with this type of injector that was on this engine, the Sellers' non-lifting injector?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that one of the best makes of injectors that is used?

A. It is a standard injector; yes, sir.

[698] Q. Is it in general use?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you examine the water glass?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did that show?

A. We found no defects in the water glass. We found it O. K.

Q. Did you examine the guage cocks?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What condition were they in?

A. Operative, properly handled. The openings into the boiler were clear.

Q. What was the condition of that engine, Mr. Pfahler, outside of this broken crown-sheet; I mean, as far as you inspected it, what was its condition and the condition of all its appliances that would in any way enter into an explosion of that kind?

A. Absolutely perfect, as far as our inspection went.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Mr. Pfahler, you say you tried these injectors and they worked without any difficulty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Even under 100 pounds pressure?

A. Yes, sir.

[699] Q. If the valve-seat was opened, where would that throw the water?

A. Ordinarily it would deliver it through the check into the boiler.

Q. If it is in perfect condition there is no reason why it shouldn't, is there?

A. No, none that I know of.

Q. Can an engineer sit in his engine and tell whether his injector is working?

A. Ordinarily; yes, sir.

Q. There is no reason why he cannot, is there?

A. No, sir. If the injector were to "break", the water would be discharged from the overflow, in that class of locomotive.

Q. And he could tell it instantly, couldn't he?

A. He could tell it; yes, sir.

Q. Whether or not it is a dark night, wouldn't cut any figure, would it?

A. I wouldn't think so.

Q. It is a recognized fact among railroads that crown-sheets are often burned under differing conditions, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

[700] Q. I suppose you, like every other man who has had experience like you have had, has seen them burned in the roundhouse, and in the yard, and at different places?

A. I have never seen one burned in a roundhouse.

Q. You never have?

A. No, sir.

Q. There is no reason why it should not?

A. There is no reason why it could not.

Q. You often bring them into the shops when they are burned, don't you? When you find an engine burned out in service, what do you do with it?

A. That would depend, ordinarily, if it were a bad burn, one that in my opinion would make the locomotive in any particular unsafe, then we would order it shopped and proper repairs made.

Q. You would send her right into the shop as soon as you discovered the burn?

A. Yes, sir; ordinarily.

Q. You do that for what purpose?

A. To make it safe.

Q. So as to be safe for the engineer to run it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When a crown-sheet gets burned, or at the time it is burned, I suppose it is physically impossible for anybody except the one higher up to tell the time when it did get burned?

[701] A. I couldn't answer that question.

Q. Certainly you never have gone that far up, have you?

A. No, sir.

Q. As to whether it got burned on one trip or on two trips before the time in question, or a week before, or a month, or whatever time it was before the date when it gave way, is not indicated by the burn, is it? It cannot be, can it?

A. I don't think I quite understand your question.

Q. I mean as to the time that the burning occurs. For instance, if a crown-sheet was burned on yesterday, and burned badly enough so that if you were to discover it you would think it safer to send it into the roundhouse for repairs, you couldn't look at the crown-sheet and tell when it was burned?

A. No, sir.

Q. And no living man could tell it?

A. I don't think so.

Q. That which causes the crown-sheet to sag is the steam pressure on it, isn't it?

A. It is a matter of two things, really. First of all, it is the pressure that causes the crown-sheet to sag; and secondly, the sheet itself is then structurally weak. Under the heating it gets soft, plastic.

Q. That is what I am coming to. Whenever a crown-
[702] sheet is burned, its usefulness is impaired, necessarily, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It becomes weaker than it was, doesn't it?

A. (Witness bows his head.)

Q. That is self-evident?

A. Well, ordinarily, a sheet in the process of manufacture may have been put through heat which is as intense and just as severe as it may be, we will say, in a case of this kind.

Q. You have got to put them through a white heat in order to roll them?

A. To flange them; yes, sir.

Q. I mean if after that time it shows it to be in marketable condition, but after it is put on the engine it receives a burn, the inevitable effect of the burn is to impair its usefulness and strength, is it not?

A. That would depend on a great many conditions.

Q. Well, can you hardly imagine a condition wherein if a crown-sheet was burned and burned badly enough for you to see it and think there might be danger connected with it, enough to send it into the shop, that you wouldn't do it because you thought its strength and usefulness were impaired to some extent?

A. Not so much of the sheet as of the stays.

Q. As of the stays?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, the stays which are in the sheet would be suffestive of impaired usefulness? That is true, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is for that reason when it is burned with pressure on it, it will be caused to get out of shape?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, tell the jury, in a case of an engine carrying
[703] 185 pounds of steam pressure, how many pounds that is to every square inch on that crown-sheet?

A. 185 pounds.

Q. On a crown-sheet of the size of that—and I believe that exhibit out there is just one-half of it—can you give the jury the pounds pressure there would be on that sheet? It would take a mighty long piece of paper to calculate that, wouldn't it?

A. No; it could be reduced to square inches, and the square inches multiplied by the pressure per square inch.

Q. Mr. Pfahler, which is the simplest injector, in the matter of operation, the lifting or non-lifting?

A. The non-lifting.

Q. That injector which you see there is the simplest injector for the engineer to operate, isn't it?

A. It is simpler in its construction.

Q. As well as in its operation?

A. No; it is not as simple of operation as the lifting injector, that is, as the average lifting injector.

[704] Q. The only thing you have to do with this one is to throw your valves open and apply your steam; but your valve must be properly opened, must it not?

A. To set this injector to work, you must open your overflow; assuming that your water valve remains open, and supplies steam through what is known as a starting valve, a lever-handled valve, located close to the engineer in the cab.

Q. Yes, sir. I understand you to say that when the water valve is opened and then with your application of steam the water must go into the boiler, do you?

A. If properly operated; yes, sir.

Q. Then this injector is the most certain in the matter of its action and the consequences, of any injector that you know of, isn't it?

A. I wouldn't like to say that, but that is a standard injector.

Q. I don't mean for you to discriminate between the different types of patented injectors. I am simply trying to get the information for the jury as to which, if you were an engineer, you would regard as the easiest for you to work, and surest of results?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That injector there?

A. The non-lifting; yes, sir, generally speaking.

Q. I understand you to say, then, as to attempting to say when this crown-sheet was burned, you wouldn't undertake to say?

A. I cannot say.

[705] Q. Whether before or after—certainly not after the accident, of course, but how long before the accident, you don't know?

A. No, sir.

Q. And no living man can tell?

A. No, sir.

Q. Stand aside.

By the Court:

I want to understand distinctly whether or not it is your opinion that that particular crown-sheet could not have been in the condition in which we now see it, except that it had fire on the under side with no water on the upper side?

Witness:

I firmly believe that, sir.

Mr. Hunt, continuing:

Q. But, as to what time, whether on this trip, or on the previous trip, no living man can tell?

A. The water was off that sheet at the time of the failure, certainly; it must have been.

Q. Now, then, Mr. Pfahler, if the water glass—well, I will make the question read on a .9 of a 1 per cent grade?

A. I cannot answer that question. I know nothing at all of the local conditions.

Q. Well, you say you have run engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never have run an engine?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then you do not know how long the water would last?

A. I cannot say; no, sir; not having had any experience [706] with it, and not knowing all of the local conditions.

Q. But you do tell the jury that a burned crown-sheet has a decided tendency to weaken the bolts which hold the sheet, regardless of the time when the burning occurred?

A. I believe that; yes, sir.

Q. As to whether the injectors and the glass guage were in the same condition at the time of the accident that they were when you found them, of course, you could not tell that?

A. I cannot tell that.

Q. You only know what they were when you got there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is all.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What are the indications on that sheet that the water was off of it at the time of the failure?

A. There are the prints of the bolt heads on the fire side of the sheet, which show that the sheet was soft, and approaching a plastic state. And there is the distinctive color which comes on a sheet, or on any piece of metal, which has been overheated.

[707] Q. Do those signs show unmistakably that the water was off the sheet at the time of the failure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You stated that heat weakened these bolts. Did you mean at the time that they are under the heat, or after the heat goes away and the water is put back on them and they are cooled off?

A. I meant, sir, that under heat, sufficiently intense heat, the bolt heads themselves become very hot and soft, and that in that condition they are really plastic, soft, and are liable to pull off.

Q. Now, when they are cooled, do they regain their original strength?

A. That would depend on the degree of over-heat, but ordinarily they would, probably.

Q. That is all.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Heat has a tendency to expand?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And cold contract?

A. Yes, sir.

A. A crown-sheet which might be leaking under cold

[707a] conditions would be checked by heat, or the heating of it would check it, wouldn't it?

A. I am not real sure of that.

Q. Well, the heating certainly expands and stops slight holes, does it not?

A. I have found that heat evaporated the water and that a leak was not visible, or perceptible, but that it was there just the same.

Q. Taking this other theory, of expansion by heat and contraction by cold. Isn't it a fact which you gentlemen of science recognize, that you can heat iron until it will stop a leak, just like you would by soaking a piece of wood until it would expand and stop a leak? Isn't that true?

A. I cannot answer that of my own knowledge.

Q. That is all.

(Witness leaves the stand.)

Court adjourn until tomorrow morning, Saturday, October the 10th, 1914, 9 a. m.

OCTOBER 10, 1914, 9 A. M.—MORNING SESSION.

Continuation of the evidence on behalf of the Defendant:

[708] S. H. LEWIS, RECALLED.

S. H. Lewis, recalled, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Were you connected with the Virginian Railway during the whole time Mr. Andrews was employed by the railway company?

A. Yes, sir; I employed him and he was killed before I left the service.

Q. I wish you would state to the jury whether or not he worked regularly?

A. He reported sick on a good many occasions.

Q. You have examined these bolts that came out of this engine, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir; I have seen them a good many times.

Q. You will notice that most of these bolt heads are broken down into the head—

Q. I wish you would please state to the jury whether or not that concave appearance of the bolt head, that is, being broken down into the bolt head, indicates whether it was broken hot or cold?

A. You mean what does that indicate?

Q. As to whether it was hot or cold, that is, whether the [709] sheet had water on top of it at the time it was broken or not?

A. The indication is it was hot at the time it broke, that the middle was weaker on account of the heat there and caused it to pull out in that way.

Q. If the bolt head had been broken cold at that point, where would it have broken?

A. It would have broken square across.

Q. Why?

A. I have seen bolt heads that were pulled off, straight square off, because the cross-sectional area is less than it would be if they were pulled down under the head that way, less metal.

Q. In other words, there is less material to pull it straight across than to break it down under the head that way?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. You are talking about a bolt that is not defective, aren't you?

A. What do you mean?

Q. A good bolt.

A. Yes, sir; I am talking of course about a good bolt.

Q. If the bolt had been defective the break would take the same grain with the bad part?

A. If the bolt was defective the metal would not be of [710] equal strength all the way there.

Q. It would follow the line of least resistance?

A. Yes, sir.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. If some of the bolts had been defective or if they had been made of defective material, would they all have broken down into the head like these are broken?

A. It is not likely they would all have been defective in the same respect and in the same way.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. If one of those tests up there of those sixteen long rods out of which these bolts were made, happened to have been omitted or carelessly made and the whole sixteen long strips were defective, how many defective bolts would that put into the crown-sheet of your engine, do you know? In other words, I want to know how many bolts would have been in those strips.

Defendant objected. Overruled. Exception.

A. I believe from long experience in testing material that if they found that percentage in the total number of bolts used it would be sufficient to tell whether the material was good or bad.

Q. Please read the question again.

[711] (Question is again read to the witness.)

A. It would be pretty hard to say, because those strips were stated to vary anywhere from 12 to 16 feet in length.

Q. 16 to 20

A. I thought it was 12 to 16; whatever it was, there was a variation in the length and then the bolts vary in length, the bolts ran anywhere from, say, 8 inches to 18 inches, that is through the side sheets and crown-sheet, so it would be pretty hard to say just how many bolts would be in the bundle.

Q. You would have 300 feet of strips approximately in one bundle?

A. Then there would be 300 feet of bolts except what they would lose from cutting off; I couldn't say the number of bolts, because the bolts vary in length considerably.

Q. Would that or not make in the neighborhood of from 100 to 150 bolts?

A. If you average the bolts at one foot in length, 300 would be 300 bolts.

(Witness stands aside.)

[712] JOHN DOARNBERGER.

John Doarnberger, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What line of work do you follow?

A. I am the master boilermaker of the Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

Q. How long have you been engaged in work as a boilermaker or as a master boilermaker?

A. I have been engaged in boilermaking for thirty-one years and for the past twenty years foreman , and for the last ten years as master boilermaker.

Q. Have you had charge, as master boilermaker, of all the boilers of the engines that are run on the Norfolk & Western?

A. That is, I have charge of the boiler work and also the men engaged on the repairing and building of locomotive boilers.

Q. Have you had any experience in examining boilers that failed from low water.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you had any experience in examining crown-sheets that have been overheated from low water?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That did not fail?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many have you seen and examined in the last thirty years?

A. Well, now, up to, say 1901, I never kept any record,
[713] in the last, probably twelve years, I have examined probably from 29 to 30 cases.

Q. Did you make any examination of the boiler of this engine, 469, of the Virginian Railway Company after the failure?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When and where did you make that examination?

A. I made my inspection on Tuesday, November the 19th, 1912, and the time of my inspection was made at 11 a. m.

Q. At what place?

A. I found the engine in the last stall in the West End erecting shop, I call it west; anyway, it was the last stall in the erecting shop of the Princeton shop of the Virginian Railroad.

Q. What caused that crown-sheet to go down?

A. An insufficient amount of water.

Q. Or lack of water on the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was there that lack of water on the crown-sheet?

A. It was at the point of failure.

Q. With reference to the explosion that blew it down; in other words, did the crown-sheet have water on it when it was blown down?

A. No, sir; it did not.

Q. What indications were there that that crown-sheet was blown down without water on top of it?

A. When I entered the fire box my attention was attracted to the peculiar condition in which the sheet had given way, and come down, the depth of it I believe was ten and three-quarter inches at the lowest point. After examining the sheet very closely I could readily distinguish the line of demarcation, that is, what is known as
[714] the low water line; I can follow it around the plate, it was very pronounced. I could notice the difference between the coloring of the sheet, which is blue inside on the part that was uncovered, and the ordinary surface rust, that is, the surface rust was black, and the ordinary surface rust between the inside color and the ordinary surface rust that was on the fire side of the sheet. After I

went down through the dome and crawled back and made an internal examination, this was on the inside of the boiler, and I noticed very clearly as I followed it around the sediment, or in other words, the incrustants that adhered to the sheet by the boiling of the water, that was removed, it was taken from the sheet. And the only way that could be taken from the sheet without being scraped off by a sharp instrument would be by heat, and it would have to be excessive heat to remove that.

Q. Was that line of demarcation on both the outside and the inside of that crown-sheet plain at that time?

A. It was very pronounced on both sides.

Q. Can you follow that line now on this sheet?

A. I believe I can. The sheet right now is obliterated somewhat, but I believe I can go right there now and follow right along. If I had a piece of chalk or something I could pick the line out for you.

[715]

Q. I wish you would take a piece of chalk and go over there and mark the color line on both sides of it, the fire side and the upper side, and I will ask the jury to go over there and see the line as you put it on there.

(The witness and jury go to the crown-sheet in the courtroom, where the witness makes a chalk line around it.)

A. I would just like to say—one minute in making this line. I do not say I am going to be as positive with this as you would make a line like that (indicating), because the fluctuation of the water movement in the boiler would probably make it vary a little bit. I don't mean now that I am going to pick the line out just like you would draw a line on a piece of paper with a pencil, but I am going to follow the line around (witness does so with a piece of chalk). Now, that is the low water line on the fire box side. This up here is the left side, and that is the right hand side; that is the back and this is what we call the front; this is where it was fastened to the flange like that (indicating); this is the flue-sheet, that is bent that way; this sheet lays on top of it there, and that sheet is riveted to it and it is caught here and caught here to hold it tight after riveting. You see that impression there, this is the back and when this sheet turns up we stand back there and I turn this sheet over like this, and this makes it the left hand side and this the right hand side, and this is next to the fire box.

Q. Now, please point out to the jury what the difference is between the burned area and the part not burned.

A. Well, you start in there; you can see that blueish cast on there; this is not as clear as when I was in the boiler on the 19th of November; but you can see it brownish there; it commences to get darker there and this little redness has taken place by atmos-
[716] pheric rust; it has been well preserved to have it as good as it is. You can see this blackness here, that is what is known as ordinary surface rust; you can see the difference in the color; that is black, and goes on back and passes down there and gets black again, and then you catch the blue oxide. Then you can notice those heads there beyond the bag along there, it is very pronounced. Now, there is more bolts out of that sheet than when I was there. These bolts here have been taken out, I believe, since I was there, because there was twelve rows to this. Call this the center line of the boiler, there ought to be sixteen rows on either side of the center, making twelve rows in all. Now, these bolts is what is known as hammer-head bolts, screwed in and hammered in with a hammer; these are button-head bolts. I do not say I can pick every one, but there is a bolt that was not defective, it was good, and we will mark that with a "G".

Q. It was good when you examined it?

A. That was good. I do not say I can pick every one, but I believe that this bolt here was fair, that is, what I mean by fair, it was slightly pulled; I will mark this "F". I do not say I am going to get every one, but if I am not mistaken that bolt was in at the time, and I will mark that fair; it was slightly pulled. Now, I will
[717] mark these here with an "F" on it, the same as the hammer-head radial stay-bolts that were in. That bolt was fair, and I will mark it fair; I do not think it was out, I am pretty sure it was not; that bolt was good and I will mark it "G". That bolt was slightly pulled and I will mark it "F". That one, I believe—it is mighty hard to pick every one, but I will mark it "F". I believe that bolt was slightly pulled and I will mark it "F", and the next one and the next one was fair. Now then, all the bolts in the back right-hand corner have been removed, I believe, since the sheet was taken out; that is, on the outside of my line encircling the low water mark, all the hammer-head radial bolts along the lower row outside of my line were removed after making my test. The right front corner bolt was good, and I will mark it with a "G"; the one back of that and the one on top of that I will mark "F", which was fair. That is about as well as I can go on that now.

Q. I wish you would tell the jury while you are on this side,

whether the water line extended an equal distance from the center on both sides?

A. Yes, sir; it was very equally distribuated, uniformly
[718] on either side of the center.

Q. If the failure had been due from any other cause but low water, would it have followed such a distinct line as that?

A. No, sir; if it had been caused from anything else but low water it would have been more confined; that is, it would have been local, there would have been a local condition.

Q. Now go to the other side of the sheet and point out the line there and tell the jury how you distinguish that line now?

A. I am going to explain as I go along. You can see that bluish oxide on there. There you can see the scale adhering to the sheet or the incrustants; you can still see it; you can still notice that; you can still see it there; you can follow it right along there; you can still see it up there (witness indicating with a piece of chalk on the crown-sheet); you can notice it along there, it is very good there; you can see the difference between here and there, where it is yet adhering to the sheet; you can see it here very clearly; I will keep on down, I think I can catch it, though I will not be positive. Now it comes right along here; you notice the difference in here; you can see the scale here; I can feel it, you see (indicating). Now, you notice a little in front there; now, while that was the highest part of the boiler, yet it was not the hottest part.

Q. Why wasn't it the hottest part?

[719] A. I will have to take a piece of paper and explain that.

Q. Can you do it by making a diagram, or would you rather have a blackboard?

A. I would sooner have the blackboard.

Q. Now, I will ask you whether or not at the time you made this examination or immediately afterward, if you made a diagram showing the burned area of that crown-sheet?

A. While I was in the fire box I made my pencil sketches with my pencil on a piece of paper; after I made my sketches I taken them like these notes, to my office, to my drawing room boy and had him draw it for me, and then I went over it to see that it was correct. I got him to trace it for me, but I really made the sketch and he lined these in for me.

Q. Is that a correct diagram which you have in your hand and which I will ask the stenographer to mark Exhibit No. H?

A. Yes, sir; and I will file it as Exhibit H.

Q. I will ask you whether or not that is a correct diagram showing the burned area on that crown-sheet, made at the time of your examination on the 19th of November?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that follow that water line as shown by your diagram or is that water line shown by your diagram indicated in red on your map?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the whole face of that crown-sheet that is shown
[720] in red the uncovered area or overheated area of the crown-sheet?

A. It was the overheated area, the uncovered area.

Q. Was that area bare of water when the crown-sheet failed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have indicated on that sheet how the bolt heads that were broken are shown?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would just tell the jury what the round bolt heads indicate and what the square one indicate.

A. These marks or these lines here denote the button-head radial stays broken off under the head, that is, the ones broken off under the head; that one there and this over here. We will start on this first lime; there is one there, there, there, there, and so on as you come up and go down, backwards and forwards clean through; that represents the ones that were broken off under the head as you see them on the table.

Q. Were all of them broken that way under the head as you see those on the table?

A. All they had there in the box that I examined.

Q. I mean the stay-bolts were still in there, the broken stay-bolts?

A. This lot (indicating) remained there intact.

Q. They were all broken in the head but they showed they were broken?

A. All I have got marked were broken under the head;
[721] that I could tell by the long bolt that remained intact in the outer roof sheet.

Q. Were any broken in the body or anywhere else except in the head?

A. They were all broken under the head, immediately under the head close up to the fire side of the sheet.

Q. What do the square bolt heads indicate on your diagram?

A. The square button-head radial stays slightly pulled but not broken; I mean by that they were bent and twisted, distorted a little bit but not broken; these all along here (indicating); you can notice when it comes to the lower end of the water line that some of them—those two are what are known as the flexible bolts and these are the extension bolts, and these were like those, they followed the outside, you will notice, and they were ruptured to an extent.

Q. Were all of those bolts that were not completely broken off under the heads along the water line, were they located along the water line?

A. Yes, sir; all along.

Q. Were any located at all in the center or any part of the arch?

A. No, sir.

Q. What does that indicate?

A. It indicates that as the water went down to the water line that it was slightly cooler and that the bolts remained slightly ruptured.

Q. Is there anything else you want to point out by the [722] sheet?

A. I would just like to say this, that (indicating) is the open circle of the button-head bolts, heads of radial stays denote the button-head radial stays in good condition. I want to point out that bolt and that bolt (indicating) inside the low water line, and that bolt and that one (indicating) I found they were in good condition. Now, the bolts enclosed by the dotted line are of the Tate flexible; that portion painted red (indicating) shows where the sheet was heated, and what I mean in here is there is a dotted line around there, Tate flexible; this bolt having a head on it, the same as this did, which screws up and goes in a bushing, after which there is a nut that goes over it, known as the cap. There are four rows of those across the boiler, or 48, and that gives the flue-sheet a chance to contract and expand.

Q. Now, take the diagram and see how close you have run the water line on the sheet?

A. (Witness does so.) I haven't seen this sheet only at Roanoke and since I have been here.

Q. Now come here to the blackboard and show us which was the hottest part of the crown-sheet. You said that it wasn't the part that was uncovered the longest?

A. (Witness does so.) This is called the water space in here: this is the back door sheet of the fire box, and this (indicating) is the

back head; here is where they threw the coal in the fire box, and this is the crown-sheet (indicating). You will notice that this crown has got a drop, I think it is four inches, if I am not mistaken, from here to here (indicating). Now, that is the drop of the crown and here is the bottom and here is the bottom, say, of the last flue, that
[723] flue starts in there and the gases pass on out through the smoke box and stack. Right under here (indicating) there is three holes drilled across, say, this way (indicating), and up here there are bolts. Now, there is a pipe, what is called the arch pipe, that goes on down into that boiler, and there is three of these arch pipes, looking at them in this way (indicating) . I will show you this boiler in a shape like this (indicating), and here is the hole in which the pipe enters at this point in there (indicating). This is a screw plug in here, that you take out between it, on this (indicating) there is a brick arch, it lays on the pipe in sections, I don't know how many sections there were in this particular boiler. Now, this brick arch extends in sections through here (indicating) and it is laid on there like that (indicating). Now, then, when he is firing his boiler down here (indicating), here (indicating) is his fire. Now, as he forces the boiler, the gases are returning there, it cannot get up here, and the fire goes back and impinges against the crown-sheet there (indicating), and as you strike there (indicating) the gases drop forward and go through the flues there (indicating), therefore this sheet between there and here (indicating) is the hottest part and this is the coldest point and yet it is at the highest point.

Q. Does that sheet show it was burned most at the hottest
[724] point where the flames were hitting it?

A. Yes, sir; it is very clear.

Q. And is there (indicating) where the greatest bagging is?

A. Yes, sir; the demarcation shows that and the marking of the sheet.

Q. I will ask you to look at those stay-bolt holes and examine the threads in them and say whether the threads are there or not, left in the hole?

A. Yes, sir; they are very good with the exception of the lower hole; the holes in each of the front corners elongated.

Q. If that crown-sheet had failed with water on top of it, would those threads have been in that condition, if the crown-sheet had been cold, would those threads have been in that condition they are now?

A. If the sheet would have failed cold?

Q. Yes.

A. No; the threads would have been stripped.

Q. When you were over there at the sheet you said that certain of those bolts were defective. What do you mean by that?

A. The ones that I have got in my diagram marked that way (indicating) were what is known as slightly ruptured, but not broken off.

Q. What caused that defect in the bolt?

[725] A. It was where the downward movement of the crown-sheet had stopped, and did not take that portion of the head with it.

Q. Was the bolt head hot when that defect was caused?

A. Oh, yes, sir; but not as hot as the others about it.

Q. Does the appearance of these bolt heads, the way they are broken and their color, indicate anything to you as to whether that crown-sheet was cold, that is, had water on top of it, or whether it was uncovered and hot at the time of the failure?

A. Now, I do not know where these came out of, at what location of the sheet; but the bolts marked with a center punch, No. 10, No. 2, the figure 9, No. 6, No. 3 and No. 11, and 10 and 1, were the hottest of the thirteen bolts before me; bolts No. 4, 7, 8, 12 and 5 were the coolest of the thirteen.

Q. Why do you say that the bolts you have picked out were the hottest and the others the coolest?

A. My reason for that is, that the bolts, most of them, not all, have a greater bend, they are also drugged out down in the body of the bolt, or in other words, the fibers are torn more. The other side being the coolest, due to the fact that the drag-out of the head of the bolt was not as great as in the others.

Q. Can you break a bolt and tear it out down in the head

[726] like those that you have picked out as the hottest, when it is cool, that is, as cool as it would be in the crown-sheet with water on top of it?

A. No, sir; you couldn't tear the bolt like that, you could not break it off under the head and tear it that way.

Q. Why not?

A. From the simple fact that the head of that bolt is three-sixteenths of an inch larger in diameter or has a larger section than the body of the bolt, which is only an inch.

Q. Have you ever tried that to see whether it would break that way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When?

A. Now, it was—I made the inspection with Mr. Slayton and

one of the Federal inspectors, and it was after the blow-down crown-sheet in engine 1136, if I remember rightly.

Q. On what road?

A. The Norfolk & Western, near Thaxton; I think it was in March, and in April we got together and we wanted to see the condition of the bolts that had been in service for any length of time to see what the appearance would be, after we broke the bolt, after the discoloring of the bolt; so I got a lot of old bolts out of the engine, I think it was 247, and I looked up the record and I found out that we put that fire box in somewhere in February, 1900; I am not
[727] positive about that, either 1900 or 1901; anyhow it was in twelve years. So I took some of those bolts and picked them up and went to the laboratory and we pulled them after seeing twelve years of service; we done it to satisfy ourselves and to get in line as to the difference between a bolt that has been in service from one to twelve years under actual conditions, and one that had been blown out, to see the difference.

Q. Have you got that bolt here?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does a bolt like that pull when it is cold?

By the Court:

Like which?

Q. A crown-sheet bolt like the ones we are talking about.

A. Like these?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. You put them in and pull them, you will have a tight hole, a hole like they were screwed in, or you will give them a little play when you pull them, they will break off in the body, the long part of the bolt.

Q. And what would you have to do to break them off at the head?

A. The only way you can break them at the head is to
[728] nick them or reduce them down to the area of the body or something else like that and then pull them.

Q. And when you do that do they break clear across or down in the head, like these broke?

A. No; when you bring them down to the diameter of the bolt, nick them or saw them to that, and you get them to break there; they will break straight across with a clean fiber and a light appearance.

Q. Professor Randolph mentioned a crown-sheet that he saw

blown out on the side of the railroad in passing down by the Alleghany tunnel when he was passing on a train. Was that a blown up crown-sheet?

A. That was a blown down crown-sheet.

Q. From what cause?

A. Low water.

Q. Have you got one of the heads of the bolts that came out of that crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would produce it and show it to the jury and show the shape of the bolt head.

Q. How did the bolts on that blown down crown-sheet break? Did they break down in the head like these, or square off, or some other way?

[729] Q. Now, I want to ask another question. Please state from your experience in examining blown down crown-sheets which failed from having low water on top of them, how the bolts in all of such crown-sheets were broken; that is, whether they were broken down into the heads of the bolts like the ones before you, which you picked out as being the hottest, or not?

By Mr. Staples:

We have no objection to that.

A. Yes, sir; all boilers that I ever examined, radial stay tight boilers [illegible] examined and that were blown down on account of low water, the heads in every case showed up as the hottest ones as I have just previously pointed out.

Q. Is there any corrugation or pocketing of this crown-sheet between the stay-bolts in the burned area?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that greater or less just prior to the time of the failure than it shows now on the sheet?

A. From the condition of the bolts before the sheet failed and went down, the corrugation was greater than it is now.

Q. Why?

[730] A. When the sheet let go and went down it took it out by a stretch, by the bag buckling, as you call it; I call it corrugation. It took that out with the exception of the two front corners here.

Q. Did you see the diagram that was produced here yesterday and offered in evidence while Mr. Slayton was on the stand, showing

the red line there on the diagram which indicated the corrugation?

A. I just noticed it as they were holding it back and forth here.

Q. Have you ever seen crown-sheets that were not burned actually to the point of failure show those corrugations?

A. In a radial stay tight boiler; yes, sir.

Q. When a crown-sheet is burned to the extent that this one was, as shown by those corrugations, I wish you would tell the jury whether or not it is possible to operate the engine with such a crown-sheet in it?

A. I did not just get that question.

Q. Read the question, please.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. As shown by the corrugations on this sheet?

Q. As they must have been before it was forced down.

A. I will have to answer that question in this way; that
[731] is, the water went down, the sheet started to heat and as it did, on all my examinations of boilers, prior to one getting in this condition, along the furrow, that is through that sheet that way (indicating), that is the weakest part of that sheet. The strongest part of that sheet is over the arch, this way (indicating), in between those four bolts at the center four bolts is the biggest area. Now, as it heats that sheet kept coming down and down and down like that (indicating), in between those bolts, the bolts and each one is holding it up and that is sagging, sagging, sagging. If I wanted to bend that sheet, take it this way and double it over (indicating), the first place that that sheet would bend would be through the line of holes because it is the weakest point of the metal that has been taken out. If I want to bend it back this way it would be impossible to do it on account of the arch. In other words—if you will permit me—I will explain it this way. If you take a little stick an inch by an inch and lay it from here to here (indicating) and step on it, you would break it, but if you take that stick and put it in a camber, and fasten it at each end you can stand on it; you see, that is the principle of that, the pressure comes on, the water is going down, and it will withstand the possible, but it will not withstand the impossible, and as it comes down it goes down all at once, it comes to a point of failure and lets go, altogether, it takes that corrugation out and leaves the heads in that position as it drops.

Q. With that corrugation in there as it was just before
[732] it failed, could that engine have been operated in service?

A. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Not if they were to catch it before the point of failure.

Q. Suppose they caught it just before the point of failure?

A. It could not have been operated without having attention.

Q. Why not?

A. In the first place, if it got to a point just before the point of failure, the bolts would have leaked to such an extent, the sheet would have expanded, you understand, and loosen the bolts in the holes and leak to such an extent that you could not generate steam.

Q. Do burned crown-sheet bolts that when they are burned as much as the corrugation on this one indicates it was burned, always leak?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any way of stopping them without taking them to the shop and plugging the holes or doing something to them or rolling them out?

A. No; not after they have once gotten to a point or to where they got in the condition this was prior to the drop down, they generally shop them; you have to do it.

[733] Q. I wish you would look at those bolt heads and compare them with the bolt heads in their normal condition, the shoulders of them, and tell the jury whether or not those bolt heads could have been put in that shape with water on top of the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir; those bolts could not have been put in that shape; that bolt is a little larger in the body than this (indicating), but that bolt could never have been put in that condition with water on the crown-sheet. This bolt (indicating) would never have been put in that condition with water on the crown-sheet.

Q. Why?

A. If it would be allowed sufficiently to break that bolt cold, the bolt would never convex that way, it would break in the body. You take that bolt now (indicating) and put it in a bent sheet like that and pull it before it was convexed that way, you might have a little spot there and there (indicating), but it will break in the body before it does here (indicating).

Q. Here are two stay-bolts marked 6 and 8, that were pulled cold in a sheet until the bolts broke in the body of the bolts. I wish you would examine them and see whether they are convexed on the shoulder like the bolts that come out of this engine 469.

A. May I see the plates that they were pulled in?

Q. Here they are (handing same to witness).

A. That is a three-eighths of an inch plate, isn't it?

Q Yes.

[734] A. The same thickness as the crown?

Q. Yes.

A. That bolt there has been stripped.

Q. Which one is that?

A. The one with the figure six; but now whether it was stripped prior to the pull or after the pull I cannot say, but it looks to me like it had been stripped prior to the pull; yes, that is right. Now, when it was pulled, it was pulled with an opening of about—of a four-inch hole over the top of the pulling machine—the bolt had not been nicked under the head and it was pulled and it broke in the body before it did go; it drawed the sheet down approximately a half an inch, and left the head absolutely parallel to the body; in other words, it is straight and not like that (indicating).

Q. On that sheet, are there any indications of the heads having been forced into the plate? In other words, are there any indentations around the holes?

A. Yes; there are indentations there.

Q. Could those indentations have been made around all of those holes in the sheet where it had water on top of it?

A. They could have been marked there, but the indentations wouldn't have been as deep, if the bolts, for instance like this, there is an indentation there (indicating), and from the depth of the indentation it looks to me that it has been made by their forcing and forcing and forcing that bolt until they stripped the head, and the vibration of cutting of it would put it to that extent. If that

[735] bolt had been kept in to throw that indentation to that depth, the bolts in that sheet would have been no good.

Q. They could not have been used at all?

A. They would have been destroyed before the pressure would have been put on the boiler.

Q. You mean before the engine was put in srvice at all?

A. That is, if it had been subjected to the same conditions this bolt was (indicating).

Q. Now, Professor Randolph says that this bolt head (No. 10), a part of the screw being left on, shows that it came down from being ripped by the force of the explosion and not from being pulled when it was hot. What do you say as to that?

A. That part that is left on that bolt, that is, this threaded

part, I do not believe that the overheating of a part of the crown-sheet or anything else had to do with that. I believe, if there was anything at all that let that stay up there, it was probably in the manufacture of that bolt, a flash, and it pulled off here and left it there, the flash was put in here (indicating), it is called a flash, that is, when you make a weld or put two pieces together and make a weld, and you weld it up good, but sometimes a little end on each side will stick up, a good many call it an inferior weld, it is not simply that, but if that is opened sufficiently it wouldn't break that because this would give
[736] before it gave there (indicating); this was the stoutest and held it ,and this (indicating) was a little flash in there; in other words, the weld wasn't right up tight.

Q. Does that flash injure or strengthen the bolt?

A. No, sir; because the bolt held; if anything it strengthened it; it held where it failed on the opposite side. If that occurs on a cold pull like that (indicating), that probably would have broke there (indicating); but it left it out down in the drag-down in the fibers.

Q. Does the color of these bolt heads indicate that they were pulled when hot or cold?

A. Which bolts?

Q. These bolt heads that you handed to me, these here (indicating).

A. They failed and let go while they were hot.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Your idea is, Mr. Doarnberger, that bolts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 11 let go while they were hot the first batch that you put out there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as to the second batch, how hot were they?

A. Not quite as hot as the others.

Q. In all of these bolts here which you have picked out first, you did not see any difference then in the temperature at which any of those bolts were heated?

A. If anything, they are all about the same, and the con-
[737] vex in them is not right up to a hair, every one you know, but they are about all the same. There (indicating) is a bolt there that is like that; that bolt is more or less corrugated since the explosion, it has got what is called damp rust; they let that bolt

get damp, the same as this one, which you can tell by the fibers.

Q. Now, then, if I understand you, this first lot of bolts that you picked up, as I have numbered them to you in my last question, were bolts that you can see no difference in the heating in, and your idea is that they were all of the same temperature?

A. Approximately so.

Q. Now, Mr. Doarnberger, the heads of these bolts being nearest the fire, and if the sheet went down, as you think, from heat, would these bolts be just as hot as the sheet?

A. If they would be anything they would probably be a little bit hotter than the sheet.

Q. Because there is more exposure to the fire?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, in this lot of bolts which you picked out, you happened to pick out the one with the figure nine on the bolt, which Mr. Slayton tells us was not in this wreck, and is a bolt which, he tells us, was never heated except to a dark red or a dull red, a bolt which Professor Randolph said wasn't as hot as these other bolts, in his opin-
[738] ion, and the bolt which Mr. Lewis tells us wasn't quite as hot as the others. If this bolt was only heated to a dull red, the balance of those bolt heads which got a little bit hotter than the sheet, were likewise heated to the same temperature in your judgment, and the sheet did not get beyond that temperature in your judgment. Is that true?

A. I didn't tell you how hot these heads were.

Q. I know you did not, but fortunately one of those bolt heads was heated under the observation of a man's eyes, and they brought it in here and told us about it. I asked you if that is not true, that, assuming No. 9 bolt head was never heated beyond a dark red or a dull red, then in your judgment the balance of these bolt heads and the sheet never went in excess of the heat of that bolt head, did it?

A. I say that all of these bolt heads were heated and heated to a point of failure. I don't care what No. 9 is or what the others are, they have been heated and they have been subject to the same drag-out, regardless of the heat; they have been heated to a point of failure and it was done without water on them, all of them.

Q. Subjected to the same drag-out as No. 9, and you don't care what the other people said about it?

A. No, sir; I am basing it on the drag-out.

Q. You say that No. 9 was in that wreck, whether other people say so or not, is that right?

A. Didn't you say so?

[739] Q. Didn't you say it was subjected to the same drag-out?

A. It was put through the same process principally.

Q. Now, then, assuming that if all of these bolt heads, including No. 9, as shown by their appearance, indicate to you that they received the same degree of temperature and that the crown-sheet likewise received that same degree of temperature, which they say in No. 9 was a dull red, I ask you what the tensile strength of that sheet and bolts per square inch is if heated to a dull red?

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't know?

A. No, sir; I don't know the tensile strength of those bolts or that sheet; I do in a way.

Q. How hot do you think that sheet was heated?

A. Probably to a light cherry red or to the point of failure; it was heated to the point of failure.

Q. Won't you indicate it in color to us?

A. It was heated to a cherry red and point of failure.

Q. The first day when you came up here, when Professor Randolph was on the witness stand, do you recall saying to Mr. Staples and me in this room here that that sheet never reached a cherry red at all?

A. No, sir; I never said that.

A. If I made a remark like that in there I do not remem-

[740] ber it at all.

Q. Do you remember saying it never got beyond a dull red?

By the Court:

Do you mean at the same place and time and to the same parties?

By Mr. Hunt:

Yes, sir.

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you recall that this further question was asked you, whether or not Mr. Walton, if he looked in his fire box and the sheet was a bright red, a cherry red, that he could not tell the difference in the glow, and didn't you reply, "Oh, but this sheet never got beyond a dull red."

A. Now I remember exactly what you are talking about. You asked me that question as I walked into the room and I came back and said as far as the light in the fire box and the crown-sheet becoming so hot as to make a ray sufficient, you could notice it in the fire box

never, and I told you that there was a brick arch between that ray if the crown-sheet had reached that heat that would dull it by the time it reached it.

Q. Do you deny that you told us that this sheet never got beyond a dull red?

A. If I told you anything I told you it got a bright
[741] cherry red, if I told you anything at all, but I remember the conversation about the other part all right.

Q. Now, Mr. Doarnberger, if this sheet was heated, the injury to the sheet was at the time of the heating, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you examine this sheet on the 19th of November, 1912, and state whether that crown-sheet was heated on the 14th or on the 10th of that same month, or could any man tell when it was heated?

A. I won't go back beyond my examination of the 19th, at the time I entered the fire box and examined it and found conditions as I have written them in my letters and made my report; I don't care whether it was a month or a day before, I am only telling you what I saw on the 19th.

Q. I don't think you understand my question.

A. Yes, sir; I believe I do.

Q. If you do, I believe you will answer it a little differently. Let's see if you understand it. Could you or any other living man reach that boiler when it was cold after the point of failure, and say whether the burning of that crown-sheet was done on the 14th or on the 10th?

A. No, sir.

Q. That is what I thought. Then you did not understand me?

A. That is all right.

Q. If this crown-sheet was burned on the 10th to the extent of buckling or bagging between the bolts and on the 14th failed, the burning on the 10th would necessarily have weakened the
[742] holding power of the stay-bolts, wouldn't it?

A. Not without it got to a point of failure.

Q. Suppose just before the point of failure the burning was sufficient to buckle the sheet, wouldn't it necessarily have weakened the holding power of the sheet and the stay-bolts?

A. What evidence have you of prior to that?

Q. I am not pointing out the evidence in this case to you to permit you to argue the case; that is one of the duties that is assigned

to counsel; but I am asking you to assume that as a fact. What would your answer be?

A. I will answer your question in this way, that had that boiler at any time prior to this accident been let get low to a point of failure, then there would have been the same evidence either by the sheet buckling, and the buckling would bring on a leaking of the crown bolts, the crown bolts would have leaked, and that would have been noticed and there would have been an examination made. Now, if it wasn't noticed and no work done on it, then that boiler was subject to no failure or any weakness.

Q. You are assuming that the inspectors of that railroad did their duty, aren't you?

A. Of that part of it, is all I say.

Q. But does not your answer to my question assume that the inspectors of that road did their full duty?

A. I don't know what the inspectors done.

[743] Q. Doesn't your answer to my question assume that they did?

A. I don't know; I am telling you what ought to be and what should have been done.

Q. We all know what ought to be done, at least we think we do.

A. I don't know; I am telling you what taken place.

Q. What percentage of engines on the Norfolk & Western today under your supervision are in service showing a buckled condition of the crown-sheet?

A. I don't know; there is approximately over 1100 engines on that road.

Q. Give us some idea.

A. Probably, I would say, in the 1100, probably two or three per cent, probably 25 or maybe 30, or something like that; but slightly, just slightly now.

Q. Then you have on the Norfolk & Western today about thirty engines in service every day, the crown-sheets of which are bagged between the bolts?

A. Slightly, slightly; some of them bolts have been renewed and set back and the sag has stayed there, it wasn't sufficient to take it out.

Q. Isn't it true that the heat when applied in that fire box to a temperature of, I believe, 380, fire box heat, which is the steam heat, I believe?

A. 387 degrees, Fahrenheit.

[744] Q. All right, when that heat is applied—

A. (Interposing.) That does not mean water in the boiler.

Q. Yes; that is the fire box heat.

A. Now, go ahead.

Q. 387 is the fire box heat, isn't it?

A. That is the temperature of the water.

Q. There is heat there to produce that—your fire box heat is what?

A. I don't know just exactly what the temperature is.

Q. It is in excess of hot water, isn't it?

A. Yes; I guess it is.

Q. When you apply that heat under a crown-sheet that is buckled with a leaking tendency, isn't it true that the expansion of the iron has a tendency to check that leak?

A. No; the expansion of the iron has a tendency to open the leak.

Q. Has a tendency to open the leak?

A. Yes, sir; expansion has a tendency to open; contraction will close it, but expansion will open it.

Q. Haven't you got that exactly reversed, Mr. Doarnberger?

A. No, sir; I have it right.

Q. You say that the contraction of the iron will close the leak?

A. No; the contraction of the iron will open the leak.

[745] That is what I asked you; I asked you if the expansion of iron wouldn't close it, and you said no, the contraction would close it.

A. I said the expansion will open it and the contraction will close it.

Q. Now, isn't it true that when heat is applied to the crown-sheet and the bolts, which creates an expansion, that checks or has at least a decided tendency to check the leakage of the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because expansion opens the leak and contraction closes it.

Q. Now you have gotten back to the other point, which does close it, the contraction or expansion?

A. The contraction closes it.

Q. Now, you are sure of that, are you, that contraction of iron closes a leak? Aren't you mistaken about that?

A. Contraction closes it.

Q. Closes the leak, you say there is no doubt about that?

A. I have answered you three times that contraction closes it, and I ain't going to answer it any more.

Q. You say it closes the leak. Mr. Doarnberger, I am not trying to catch you at all, I think you have just gotten it mixed, that is all, and I want to give you a full and fair chance to see if you are not in error. I want to be perfectly fair with you. Contrac-
[746] tion is when the iron gets smaller, isn't it?

A. Have I got to answer that again, Judge?

By the Court:

Yes; he has a right to ask you that.

A. Yes, sir; contraction takes up.

Q. Is that when the iron itself gets smaller?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And expansion is when the iron itself gets larger?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then isn't it the expansion of the iron that closes the leak and not the contraction?

A. No; it is the contraction that closes the leak and expansion opens it.

Q. I think the difference between us is that you are talking about the contraction of the hole and I am talking about the expansion of the iron.

A. Yes; and I will tell you right now, when expansion comes on iron expands and the whole thing bends with it; contraction comes on, the iron closes up and the hole closes with it. I know what you are trying to do; they all move together, uniformly.

Q. Take this sheet with a bolt in it, in a leaky condition, we will heat that to a point where the iron expands?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Doesn't the expansion of that iron in the first place
[747] made this bolt bigger?

A. Yes, sir; if the bolt is heated with that.

Q. Yes; both being heated, it makes that bolt swell up?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It causes this iron here likewise to swell out and expand?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It causes this iron to expand?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If this iron is expanding, going up to meet the bolt—

A. (Interposing.) What do you mean, expand or contract?

You jump to contract now. You make yourself very plain, I am going to listen to you now.

Q. I think you have got it twisted.

A. No; I have got it right but you are trying to twist me up.

Q. Indeed I am not. If the bolt and plate both being heated to the same temperature, it certainly is true that the bolt swells with it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That isn't contraction, is it, that is expansion, isn't it?

A. No, sir; that is contraction.

[748] Q. Taking this same plate and getting off our heat proposition, and going to something else we won't have no disagreement on. Now, the force which was applied to this, you say, was through a four-inch opening?

A. Approximately; I did not say what it was; I said about four inches approximately, and it was much hotter than up close to the bolt.

Q. They told us it was three inches.

A. I say approximately four inches.

Q. If it had been a four-inch opening instead of three inches, you would have found a greater sagging of the plate, wouldn't you?

A. The larger the opening the greater the sag.

Q. The opening on the crown-sheet is a four-inch opening, as compared with this, isn't it; because the radial stays are four inches apart?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If this is tested on a three-inch opening, it is not the same as it would be if it was a four-inch opening, or if a four-inch opening is applied, would it?

A. No.

Q. Isn't the force applied to this plate exactly the reverse of the force applied to the crown-sheet in a boiler?

A. No, sir; if he had a four-inch opening or assuming it is, pulled on that bolt at all four points, he would have the same condition if you pulled that cold, as this would pull (indicating).

[749] Q. I will ask you, please, to take this sheet and the other one which they say was pulled cold, and tell the jury if the threads in each instance are not torn out. In other words, you see the other threads in it when you hold it this side, do you, and turn it this side and you cannot see the thread, isn't that true?

A. Wait a minute, I will talk to you a little.

Q. All right.

A. When that comes down there, the pull, as that iron pulls down, assuming he had that in a four-inch opening, came down and got to going down, I believe when it got to that part (indicating) it stopped this way, it took a permanent set, and this became the weakest point and failed (indicating). As that went down, going through the neutral axis of this metal, that is closed because this (indicating) opens, and that is why you find the opening in the bottom.

Q. Don't you find the reverse conditions of that on that crown-sheet?

A. No, no.

Q. Isn't it true that you can stand on either side of that crown-sheet and see the threads in it?

A. No; the largest opening of them holes in that whole thing, you will find it—

Q. (Interposing.) Tell me about that.

A. All right, I am going to tell you, the largest holes you will find on that plate, you will find on the fire side, the largest, now, that is, if we can detect it.

[750] Q. I think we can; I want to test the accuracy of it to see if you haven't got it reversed again. The largest side of the opening now, you say, where the threads are most visible, is next to the fire, that is what you told us, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, think once again and see if the largest opening on that plate isn't next to the water?

A. The largest hole is on the fire side of that sheet, and the smallest on this side, the water side.

Q. The bolt in this instance was on this side, wasn't it?

A. The head of the bolt was on this side.

Q. Now, do you find the largest thread where the bolt was or where the head of the bolt was?

A. We find the small thread is where the bolt head was, and the largest at the reverse side of the head.

Q. That is exactly what I thought

A. That is right; you are right there.

Q. You done got wrong on that sheet, though.

A. No, I haven't.

Q. Do you say that the largest opening in that hole where the threads are most visible is next to the bolt head or next to the bolt?

A. The largest opening of them holes is next to the bolt head.

Q. And not the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q Was the largest opening in this (indicating) next to
[751] the bolt or the bolt head?

A. The largest of that was opened on the opposite side to the head.

Q. Next to the bolt and not the head?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why should the crown-sheet be next to the bolt head, the largest opening of the crown-sheet be next to the bolt head if the largest opening in this is next to the bolt?

A. I am talking about bending the sheet; I am telling you this was closed and this opened (indicating), and that was bent otherwise.

Q. Now, let's come back.

A. I am going to answer it that way every time you ask me.

Q. I ask you again, is the largest opening of that hole in the crown-sheet next to the bolt head or following the length of the bolt?

A. The largest opening in that hole is on the fire side next to the bolt.

Q. To the bolt or bolt head?

A. The bolt head.

Q. Why isn't it so in this case?

A. Simply from the fact this bolt (indicating) went down like that (indicating), you have the idea that because the bolt pulled the iron plate—it is the curvature of the iron that opens it there
[752] and closes it here (indicating).

Q. I asked you if exactly the same pressure wasn't put on this that was put on the crown-sheet?

A. The sheet bent different.

Q. That is exactly what I asked you, and if it was not exactly the reverse pressure.

A. That sheet was pulled this way, you see, and that one this way, and here is the head (indicating).

Q. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. Then the thread in this case is torn exactly opposite to your thread in the sheet?

A. That is bending all of that plate, and when that went down over there, it tore these heads off and bent the plate that way (indicating).

Q. All right.

A. When this went down it broke the body and pulled it the other way. The iron gathered here (indicating), stretched here and gave you that taper in that hole, the same as over there.

Q. I don't credit you with any desire on earth to get it twisted,

if you could. Isn't it true that the force, according to your contention, on that sheet was applied from the bolt down on the sheet, the pressure?

A. Just as you are holding your hand now?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't it true that the force in this engine was applied
[753] exactly opposite, isn't it so?

A. No, sir; it is the same principle.

Q. I am not talking about the principle, I am talking about the force.

A. Force, it is the same thing.

Q. Isn't the force applied in this case below the sheet and in that case above the sheet?

A. You could have burned that up and had the same thing again.

Q. Could heat have been there when that was burned up?

A. It was equally distributed whether you burned that sheet that way, or whether you burned it this way (indicating).

Q. I will ask you this, in the test which has been made here by Mr. Slayton and Mr. Sample, wherein the bolt heads have pulled off, after the bolt head and bolt was screwed very tightly into the iron and heated, they tell us that in both of these instances the head pulled off below the plate. Did you hear that?

A. No, sir.

Q. This is the plate (No. 7) they told us was tested hot, and when the bolt head and part of the bolt was heated that the plate was put in a test machine and in this instance the bolt head pulled off and knocked the bolt broke. Was that due to the tight screwing in of the bolt or what was it due to?

A. Where is the heads of these bolts? I want to see them.

[754] Q. Here they are handing same to witness).

A. Have you got the body of this bolt?

Q. Yes, sir; here it is (handing same to witness).

A. Now, what is your question?

Q. Please read the question to him, or I will put my question again. My question is, the threads of that bolt, so far as I can determine, does not show any injury by tight screwing in of the bolt, does it?

A. No; that bolt was applied all right.

Q. Now, they tell us that when they put that bolt in they use a three-foot wrench?

Q. Then I will put the question this way. These bolts are nicked for the purpose of permitting them to break off as you twist them in the boiler, aren't they?

A. If you get them down below this section here (indicating) or much lower here than there (indicating), sufficiently to tighten them up good, they generally break off. In some places they won't allow that, but there is no objection to it; some put it up tight enough, and when it sets itself it ought to wrench off.

Q. This is put there for the purpose of screwing that bolt [755] in, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in this particular instance, any way, these bolts were screwed in the crown-sheet until they were wrenched off?

By Mr. Hall:

No, sir; that is not so; they were screwed in and nicked, and knocked off.

By Mr. Hunt:

The boilermaker from Princeton says that is what they did.

Q. Now, Mr. Doarnberger, that is a common practice, you say, to screw this in until this does wrench off?

A. If they get them down far enough to pull the section here (indicating).

Q. It takes a right good wrench for that purpose?

A. No, sir; not so much.

Q. What sized wrench?

A. You can take a 24 or 26 or 28-inch wrench and do that, if they nicked it about three-fourths or five-eighths of an inch through the section.

Q. Nicked as that is?

A. That bolt won't wrench off, that bolt is not nicked, that will strip, the same as that was stripped (indicating); that will strip that thread before this will wrench off.

By Mr. Hall:

They were made large and made that way for the purpose of testing whether you could screw them in tight enough to injure the bolt in the head.

Witness:

Here is about a standard head.

[756] Q. Well, let us lay this aside and take up one that there is no question about. This is supposed to furnish you a hold for your wrench to screw this bolt in until, when being nicked, it screws off?

A. Yes, sir; that is about a standard. Now, then, they will take and nick that right in there (indicating), and that will wrench off by the time this sets, without destroying that thread.

Q. They told us that after they screwed this (indicating) in that plate and gave it a test under heat, the test which they brought into court, pulled off under the head and that they did not nick them and screw them in that way, but tested them cold when they broke in the body. That being true, what would it indicate, that the tight screwing of the bolt in the plate had injured the tensile strength of the bolt head?

A. Mr. Hunt, you have asked me so much there, I really don't remember one-third of it.

Q. Read the question to the witness.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. Screw which in that plate?

Q. The bolt; it is immaterial which one.

A. I want you to tell me which bolt you are talking about now; I want to play fair. Tell me what bolts you are talking about.

[757] Q. It is immaterial which bolt; it is the principle involved that I am trying to get at, irrespective of any bolts.

Q. Pick up the bolt you are talking about.

Q. We will leave all the bolts out, and I will ask you if it is true that a bolt screwed into a plate until the head wrenches off and put under a tensile strength test, under heat, and the bolt head pulls off, while a different test made cold, the bolt part in the center of the bolt, would that indicate that the tight screwing in of the bolt head had weakened the tensile strength thereby?

A. No, sir. Now, I will ask you a question.

Q. No, don't do that.

A. I have a right to answer the question.

Q. You said you were going to ask me a question.

A. When they took that bolt and nicked that head and screwed it up there, sufficiently to wrench the square off, and heated it, that is, the plate and bolt, and put it in the machine and pulled it, certainly it would break off under the head.

Q. That is what I have been trying to get at, Mr. Doarnberger.

A. I am not through. Then they take another bolt and that was put in cold, and they turned that down and they wrenched until they wrenched the thread off. Yes, it would break in the body.

Q. That is perfectly clear, under those conditions, you would expect it to break at those two points.

A. Yes, sir; I am talking of hot and cold bolts.

[758] Q. Hot or cold, you would expect these identical results?

A. I am talking how a hot one would break and how a cold one would break, applied under same conditions by wrenching the head off, at one heat it will break under the head, and take another one or a cold one and turn it until you wrench the head off or pull it off, and it don't break in the body it is a bad weld.

Q. Isn't that upon the theory that, having applied your bolt so tightly to the sheet that when you then put it in the fire, under your theory, the expansion, and I submit it is expansion and not contraction—under the theory of expansion it is that iron expanding and coming up against the head and the bolt head expanding and going down against the iron, that causes that weakness. That is true, isn't it?

A. No; the movement of the load on that part (indicating) is taken from the body; the bolt had fibers, you know. A bolt will stretch and whatever load will come on it, it is figured out, a four-inch body and a four-inch bolt, that will withstand the heat is away beyond the elastic limit of the body of the bolt, and you have not only got the head to protect it, but it has got the thread for holding power.

Q. If that bolt was heated at the head and heated up to a point one and a half inches above the head?

A. You mean below the head?

Q. Yes, sir. Where do you expect it to part?

[759] A. Right there (indicating).

Q. Isn't it true that in every bolt that you saw in the old boiler was heated for as much as an inch and a half above the head?

A. No, sir; it was just on the point of each bolt, probably from three-eighths to half an inch on the end of each bolt, about the thickness of the sheet or maybe a little more. You take that bolt there (indicating) and it is broke off first on the fire side of the sheet, and it went through a plate three-eighths of an inch thick, and the end of that bolt was discolored three-eighths to half an inch.

Q. They told us an inch and a half?

A. Probably some heads would generate that far; I couldn't s

COPY BOUND CLOSE

it; they have got better eyes than I have, probably.

Q. If it was heated up for an inch and a half above it, you would expect it to part above the sheet?

A. No, sir; the hottest part was right there, up in there (indicating). It would have the protection of the steam, moisture would help that; but right there under the head is where it gave way.

Q. Can you or any living man look at that sheet and tell to what extent the corrugation or bagging or sagging was prior to this failure?

A. No; you could only probably judge that by if they would know where these heads came through the overheated area, just exactly, and these came out. I will venture to say—

[760] Q. (Interposing.) Don't venture.

A. I will say they came out of the hottest part, then these bolts that I picked out first, if they could put that through there and then get a section that bent, going down this way and then up (indicating), then you could get it. I don't know, but I believe that Mr. Slayton illustrated that pretty nicely, but I wouldn't say that is just right, however; this drop is here (indicating), and this drop is here (indicatin), going through; that is really the buckling between the bolt this way longitudinal through the plate.

Q. These you think were in the hottest part?

A. The ones I picked out first.

Q. These two you hold in your hand you think were?

A. I don't know.

Q. Look at them and see.

A. Give them all to me.

Q. You happened to pick up No. 9 again, that they say wasn't in it?

A. I don't know, you might switch some of the bolts on me.

Q. As a matter of fact, do you know whether any bolt in that lot ever came out of that boiler?

A. When I was there and made my inspection, Mr. Bowden wasn't there, and I went to Mr. Slayton's office and he took me. I think his office was over the depot, and he took me on up to where the sheet was, and he told me when I got through that he wanted

[761] me to come back and have dinner with him, and he asked me whether I needed any assistance, and I told him no, that I would rather be left alone and have nobody about, and when I came out I asked for the bolts, I couldn't find none.

Q. There was none about the boiler?

A. No, sir; none at all; that is, heads now; and I went and in-

SE IN CENTER

quired about them and they said Mr. Miller was the man, and I asked him and he had them there packed up in a little box.

Q. Mr. Miller?

A. I think that was his name, but I am not sure; the assistant foreman, anyhow, of the shop. Then I examined those bolts carefully, all they had, and it looked to me that they had more than that, there was a box that wide and that long (indicating), and I looked over them. The only thing I can say, is that I saw them there and I will have to rely on the honesty of the management of the Virginian Railway to have them here; if they are so dishonest to bring something else here, that is different. But there is one thing I will say, that without they had the same condition of the 469, they could not have manufactured those bolts.

Q. They could have picked them from any other crown-sheet that went down?

A. If they wanted to be dishonest they could.

[672] Q. As a matter of fact, do you know whether any one of those bolts were ever in that boiler?

A. Only by the honesty of the Virginian Railway management sending them here.

Q. Mr. Miller was the man who had them in charge at that time, you say?

A. He had them there and when I asked him if he had all of the heads saved from this boiler, he said yes, and I laid them out and looked over them.

Q. There were a great many more than these?

A. Yes, sir; if my memory serves me rightly, there were.

Q. When an inspector goes to make an inspection of that kind the bolt head is one of the principal things he relies on, isn't it?

A. No, not necessarily so.

Q. Could you do it without the bolt heads?

A. I could tell the condition of the sheet without that; I like to see them, it helps you; but so far as the bolt heads, we had several of them, and we never found the bolt heads—

Q. (Interposing.) I am not talking about that. I asked you this question, if you or any living man can tell how far that was bagged down before the failure of the crown-sheet, and you answered me that you would base your calculations on these bolt heads, didn't you?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. Well, do you—what do you say about it now?

[763] A. Read that again.

Q. I asked you if you or any living man could tell the extent that that crown-sheet was buckled down before the explosion, and you said that you would base your calculation of that upon the appearance of these bolt heads, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you base it on anything else?

A. Yes, sir; I can base it on the discoloring, the demarcation on the sheet under the bolts and there is a lot of evidence besides this. You asked me about corrugation, and I said corrugation, that it could be based on that.

Q. Give me those things again, discoloration?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What else?

A. And the color under the bolts.

Q. What else?

A. And the drop of the crown.

Q. Is that all?

A. If there is any more of them as we go along, I might think of it.

Q. Will the discoloration indicate to you or aid you in any way in determining how deep the bagging between the bolts was before the failure?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then we can cut that out.

A. No, sir; I am going to take the sheet as it is now; [764] don't cut that out; no.

Q. If that discoloration of the sheet will enable you to figure the depth of the sagging in that sheet between the bolt heads, please explain to the jury how it is possible you can do it?

A. You mean the sagging prior to this here?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, sir.

Q. That wouldn't help you on that?

A. No, sir; I am talking about the sheet as it is, the way I find it.

Q. The discoloration wouldn't help you to determine the depth of the bagging between the bolts prior to the giving way?

A. No, sir.

Q. Would the color under the bolts aid you in that in any way?

A. Yes, sir; the bolt that remained in the roof of the sheet, the discoloring of the end of the bolt that was screwed into that sheet; yes, sir, that will.

Q. How?

A. It will be a very blue oxide, the color of that sheet, and probably it shows more plainly really than the sheet does, the ends of the bolts.

Q. If the color of the bolts left in the engine is a blue oxide, how deep does that indicate the bagging was between the bolts before the accident?

A. I cannot tell you that.

[765] Q. I thought you said you could?

A. No; I did not.

Q. Then do you say that the color of the bolt ends will not aid you in determining the extent of the sagging between the bolts prior to the accident?

A. No, sir; it will, I will say that again; no, sir; it won't do it.

Q. Now, will the drop of the crown enable you to tell the extent of the bagging between the bolts prior to the accident?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then have you got anything on earth to determine that except these bolts?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. What?

A. The discoloring of the sheet between the blue oxide and the ordinary surface rust. I am talking about the crowned end of the button head bolt and the dropping of the sheet.

Q. I do not think you understand my question.

A. Yes, sir; I do.

Q. Tell me again, then, if the discoloration in the sheet—

A. (Interposing.) Of the uncovered area, the overheated area.

Q. That the discoloration, or the color at the end of the bolt, with the drop of the crown will enable you to figure out how deep or to what extent the bagging between the bolts was prior to the

[766] giving away?

A. No, sir; that won't do it; I told you that three times. Them conditions won't enable me to give you the buckling prior to the failure.

Q. I know that is bound to be true; but you have said, as I understood you, at least, that that would do it?

A. I didn't no such thing.

Q. Then I will ask you if there is anything on God's earth that will enable you to tell the extent of the bagging between the bolts prior to the giving way except these bolt heads here before you?

A. I wouldn't need them, and I can tell. I don't need those;

I can tell by the discoloring of that sheet, by the ends of those bolts and the drop of that.

Q. I think you misunderstand me again.

A. Not on your life; I understand you very well. I tell you what you want me to do; I cannot do it; I cannot tell what that buckling was prior to that failure when it let go and went down.

Q. That is what I want to know.

A. I told you I could tell afterwards.

Q. How much it is buckled down now?

A. I can tell by the failure of the sheet.

Q. You can tell now it is buckled down, can't you?

A. Yes, sir; it has gone way down ten and three-quarter inches.

Q. But you do tell me that prior to the giving way you don't know the extent of corrugation between the bolts?

A. No, sir.

[767] Q. If you don't know the extent of corrugation between the bolts prior to the giving down, how can you tell Mr. Hall that it would leak?

A. There is corrugation there, and if that were cut out prior to the explosion they would have found corrugation there sufficient to make it leak.

Q. How do you know unless you know the extent of the corrugation?

A. Corrugation is bound to take place before the drop.

Q. I asked you if the corrugation is there prior to the accident, as you tell us, about thirty of your engines are in service with corrugations, and you told Mr. Hall that if the amount of corrugation as indicated by this sheet, the corrugation and not the drop, was on that sheet prior to the giving way of it, it would have leaked, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, then, how much corrugation was there prior to the giving way?

A. I couldn't tell you to the extent of the depth of it, but there was enough to keep on coming and coming to the point of failure.

Q. We are assuming that the corrugation was there prior to the point of failure and prior to the failure.

[768] A. What do you mean?

Q. Before that morning or before that night.

A. There would have been evidence there if there had been.

Q. What evidence would there have been?

A. I will have to answer the question the same way.

Q. All right.

A. Had that boiler sometime prior to this accident been let get low enough in water to cause corrugation, which would have followed leakage, then that boiler would have leaked; it would have been noticed and it would have been worked on. Now, if that boiler had not been gotten low to the point of danger and there was no evidence of that, then the boiler was never in any way injured.

Q. The point I am trying to get at is, can you tell the jury, assuming that the corrugation was there prior to the accident, at some other time, can you tell the jury the extent of that corrugation?

A. If there had been corrugation there prior to the accident, I don't know whether there was or not; I don't know.

Q. You cannot tell there was?

A. Prior to the accident, no, sir.

Q. Then, of course, you cannot tell the extent of it?

A. Prior to the accident, no.

Q. Then, not knowing the extent, you couldn't tell whether it would cause a leak, could you?

A. Prior to the accident, no, sir.

[769] Q. The lines of demarcation on a sheet are the same, or about the same, under the bottom side as it is on the top side?

A. You mean in coloring?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, no; there is absolutely a difference between the two.

Q. A difference between the color?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But the point of low water would show underneath just the same as it would show on top?

A. About, yes; you could trace it, but not like you could draw a line straight on a paper.

Q. But wherever you could trace it, it would be at a corresponding point on the sheet?

A. Nearly.

Q. Now, I want to see if you have not missed it about an inch and a half.

A. Probably I have missed it three inches.

Q. Your line here, where I hold that pencil, is that your line?

A. I made it a little heavy over there.

Q. When you get on that side it is a little over here (indicating).

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do I hold the pencil right there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that right?

[770] A. No; that is a little low there; I was a little nervous there.

Q. What I want to ask you is, if the line of stretching, where the stretching begins, the line which you have followed on both sides of that sheet?

A. No; the stretching may have moved something on the water side slightly, but not on the fire side.

Q. I thought you told us that the stretching on the fire side eliminated the soot, which was one of the means of determining that?

A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Is that true or not?

A. No, sir; I didn't say that.

Q. The man that said that did not know what he was talking about then?

A. I don't know whether he did or not; I am talking about myself, I don't care what anybody else said.

Q. You do not believe that is true?

A. What?

Q. On the bottom side where the soot gives way.

A. The soot?

Q. Yes; the soot or whatever it is that clings to the sheet in the firing?

A. I call it ordinary surface rust.

Q. Now, where the surface rust gives way on the fire side, you do not think that is in a line, do you?

A. No; wherever you can see ordinary surface rust, there has been water there; where you see the blue oxide or demarcation between the two, is the only means we have for tracing the water

[771] line, as I have done in this case.

Q. If there was a mud deposit on that sheet, the crown-sheet could burn with water over it, couldn't it?

A. If it would have a sufficient deposit, it wouldn't burn; that is, it wouldn't drop the crown-sheet; but it would cause a corrugation and cause the bolts to get loose and leak. Do you mean if there would be a heavy deposit, incrustants that would keep coating and coating?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir; it will make an improper circulation.

Q. And your sheet will go down from it, if I understand you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If at this end where you said it was not the hottest, as you drew your diagram there, didn't you find evidence of a mud rust there now?

A. A very light scale, just a coating.

Q. Doesn't the stretching of the sheet take away from it all question of rust as you have described, and mud deposit, and everything of that kind?

A. No.

Q. It relieves an evidence of it, doesn't it?

A. It won't be as clean as that (indicating); that has been burned off and burned off by excessive heat.

Q. Now, then, if that crown-sheet had been heated to a point of weakening the crown-sheet six or eight hours prior to this accident, you would see the same mark that you see now, wouldn't you,

[772] or some evidence of burning?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. If it would have been heated six or eight hours prior to this failure, six or eight hours would have been in that condition, I mean down where it is at, the damage would have been done, if it had been under the same conditions six or eight hours prior to this the same thing would have happened six or eight hours and it would have met the same condition.

Q. You do not understand it?

A. Yes, sir; I do.

Q. Isn't it true that you can burn a sheet without its going down, so that you can see some marks of burning on it?

A. With water on it?

Q. I did not say anything about with or without water.

A. I do not know what you mean.

Q. Let us take the water off for the present; take the water off the crown-sheet and burn it, and it does not go down, can not you go there and see some marks of burning, the same as you could if it did go down?

A. You mean, if I put a piece of iron in the fire and burn it and burn it and make it hot and throw it aside, certainly you can.

Q. You can do it and the same evidence of burning is

[773] there, whether it was made yesterday, today, last week or last ten months?

A. On the contrary, I can take that and put water on it and you cannot tell; I can by the sediment that is coated over it, the same as this.

Q. But if it is cooled before the water is put on it, the mark is still there, isn't it?

A. The one mark is there, the fire mark.

Q. That is what I mean.

A. Yes, sir; you can tell the outside of that fire mark, as I have done here; I can tell the difference between the heated area and the unheated area, when I get to it.

Q. You cannot tell the difference between the heated area, assuming that heated area had been made six hours before, you couldn't tell whether it was six hours younger or six hours older, could you?

A. I do not catch you. What is that question?

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever run an engine?

A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know anything about the length of time that it would take an engine to consume water, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. You have no knowledge on that subject?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about injectors?

[774] A. The only thing I know about injectors. I know how they are operated, I know how to put the water on, whether it would be a Seller or whether it would be a Monitor; but outside of the lifting of water and the amount that it would deposit and all like that, per minute and hour, no, sir; I know how they are applied and know when they work.

Q. Do you happen to know whether one injector is enough to run an engine of this type?

A. No, sir; no more than in riding along; I ride on the engine and see the engineer use his own injector and then sometimes they will holler over there, and they tell me they throw about six or seven hundred gallons an hour, but that is what I get from the boys at Blacksburg, and it will be 4500 gallons in it, and the heat of the boiler 378 degrees, pressure 212; I get that from Professor Randolph's little fellows; I help them along and try to give them a little practical experience with their paper work.

Q. Is is or not true that it is your custom and the custom of the road that you work for to refuse to give information, technical information, if they know that information will help the plaintiff in a suit against another railroad?

[775] Defendant objected. Objection sustained.

By Mr. Hall:

I have no objection to his asking the question if he applies to the witness for information in regard to this explosion and whether he was furnished that information or not.

Q. I will ask you if you had known information that would help me in developing a case of the plaintiff against this railroad, would you have given it to me?

A. Yes, sir; I have given it to you in my office, and you thank me for it; you spent the whole afternoon, you and Mr. Staples, and I showed you all my drawings, and everything before I came up here. I took my stuff out and you stayed all the afternoon with me. I told you the conditions of everything, and what I done, and you thank me for it. Mr. Lewis gave you permission to come to me and let me give you all the information I could.

Q. Didn't you limit us to theblue print, this thing right here, and didn't you decline to give us your written report?

A. If I am not mistaken, and I think my memory serves me rightly, this is what I showed you, and you asked me for a copy of that, and I told you I couldn't give you that; I told you the company would not allow me to give you that, but I would give you the benefit of it in my office, and I took you and showed you everything, and you told me there that you were sorry I wasn't with you.

[776] Q. Didn't you tell me that that report was private property of the road you had made it for and you couldn't show me your conclusions in writing, but I could see the sheet?

A. If I showed it to you I showed you the whole business, and I believe I read you that part of it, and you asked me if I couldn't give you a copy of that and I told you no, I wouldn't do it without either Mr. Lewis' or Mr. Kearney's consent, that if you went up and got Mr. Lewis or Mr. Kearney and let them say that I could give you this I would do it. The same way with the Federal inspectors, I say if you will go up and ask Mr. Lewis or Mr. Kearney I will be glad to give you any information, it is nothing to me.

Q. Did you ever testify for the plaintiff during your thirty-one years of experience, in any damage suit against any railroad on a similar question as this?

A. I never have, due to the fact that I never have been asked to. I have been asked by the Virginian and by the C. & O. and by Professor Goff of the Illinois University, in May, 1912, but I have never been asked, or I would go for the plaintiff if the plaintiff would

ask me.

Q. Is it a common occurrence that the water glass in an engine becomes clogged up with scale or a substance so that it does not show the correct level of the water in the boiler?

A. Yes, sir; it can become clogged.

Q. If the water glass shows a varying level in that boiler,
[777] it would indicate a rise of the level of the water in that boiler and it would indicate that the injector was putting it in there, wouldn't it?

A. I cannot answer you on the appliance and mountings of an engine; I did not examine the mountings.

Q. If the glass is stopped up at the top with a lime deposit or other deposit, would it correctly register the amount of water in the boiler?

A. No, sir.

Q. Suppose it is stopped up at the bottom, what then?

A. The same thing would happen, but I cannot answer you on the mountings. I did not examine any of them; that is out of my line.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Did I understand you to say that you spent the whole afternoon explaining this boiler failure to the gentlemen representing the plaintiff?

A. They weren't down the whole afternoon, but they were there probably two and a half or three hours, or two hours, maybe not quite that long; but the better part of the afternoon.

Q. You say your recollection is that you showed them your report or read it to them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they thanked you for the information you gave them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why did they thank you and what did they say?

[778] A. After I got through, I told them there was no secret about it, and I went up to my files and showed them where I kept it and I got it down and I read my report, and attached to it was my diagram, and I explained it to them. They asked me a lot more questions and I kept answering them, and I said something to them and they said, "I am sorry you ain't with us, John," and I said, "I am sorry myself," but I do not like to say now what my reply was to them.

By Mr. Hunt:

Go ahead and say anything you told us.

A. I told them that they had hopeless case from a low water standpoint.

Q. What did they say?

A. They said they were very sorry I wasn't with them.

Q. You are on very friendly terms with both of these gentlemen, arent' you?

A. Bruce and I are old partners.

Q. And that is what you told him confidentially when he came to you and asked you about this case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were asked some questions about being able to tell the extent of the corrugation on this sheet before it failed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there any corrugations on the sheet now, between the stay-bolt holes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that the corrugations before the failure must [779] have been greater than it is now?

A. Yes, sir; because the indications at the front end of the sheet there on either corner show pretty heavy now, yet where the stretch had not been across it, it is still remaining in there, the stretch did not take it out, it did not go down as far.

Q. If it was corrugated as much before the failure, as those corrugations in the corner show, why didn't the stretch take them out?

A. It was much greater up where it was hottest than down there; that would be evident right there; that corrugation down at the low point where it had not been so severely hot as where it had been severely hot.

Q. Suppose it was corrugated all over as much as it is in the corner prior to the time of the failure, would it have leaked?

A. Yes, sir.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. In that same conversation, didn't you also tell me that your road might get in trouble if you did anything against another road, and that you could not call on those people to help you when your road was in trouble?

A. No, sir.

[780] Q. How was it? Tell the jury how you said that?

A. I never said that; no, no.

Q. Tell us exactly what you said about that?

A. I never made a remark like that; I most emphatically deny that. I will tell you as far as other roads. If we would call on other roads to help us out, it ain't that we would probably have to call, we are not better than any other railroad, but I cannot recall in my thirty-one years, with the exception of a few years that I was with the American Locomotive Company and the Lake Shore in Cleveland, that we have asked a company to come over and assist us in anything of this kind, with the exception of the Federal boiler inspectors, and my report of eighteen boilers, nine of them turned in, I was sustained by the Federal government in Washington.

Q. By whom were you sent to Princeton to make this examination?

A. By Mr. W. H. Lewis, on account of Mr. Kearney being away; he telegraphed me to go.

Q. Mr. Lewis is the superintendent of motive power for the Norfolk & Western Railway Company, isn't he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your salary is being paid now by the Norfolk & Western Railway Company, while you are here in this case, isn't it?

A. I havent asked about that question. If they do not

[781] pay it I am certainly going to ask the Virginian to pay it.

Q. Your salary while you were making this inspection in Princeton was paid by the Norfolk & Western Railroad that you worked for, wasnt it?

A. After I made my inspection and sent my report to Mr. Lewis, and he sent it on to Mr. Slayton, Mr. Slayton wrote back, thanking Mr. Lewis and paid me a compliment.

Q. I didnt' ask you about the compliment.

A. And he turned the letter over to Professor Leary, and he asked me to come up there, and he showed me the letter and he said he wanted me to see the letter, and Mr. Slayton in that letter asked what my expense would be, and I told Mr. Leary to tell Mr. Slayton that the expense would be nothing. That is what I told him, that I did not fell like charging two dollars going over and back, and I had lunch with Mr. Slayton and I did not like to send a bill like that in.

(Witness stands aside.)

[782] F. T. SLAYTON, RECALLED.

F. T. Slayton, recalled for Defendant:

Further examination by Mr. Hall:

Q. Some confusion seems to have arisen as to how those two cold tests were made. I wish you would tell, just identifying them by the number, how each one was made with reference to screwing the bolt into the plate?

A. The cold test, you mean?

Q. Yes; the two cold tests.

A. No. 5 was screwed into a three-eighths of an inch sheet.

Q. Nos. 6 and 8 were the two that were pulled? Take 6 and 8.

A. No. 6 was screwed into a plate three-eighths of an inch thick, with a three-foot wrench, until the threads in the sheet or bolt, I couldn't tell which, was stripped so that they would both turn around, pulled cold.

Q. That was No. 6?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, take No. 8; how was that screwed in?

Plaintiff objected. Objection overruled.

A. No. 8 was screwed into a three-eighths of an inch plate tight and pulled cold until the bolt broke in the body.

Q. Was it screwed in tight enough to break off the head [783] of the bolt?

A. No; No. 8 wasn't. No. 8 was screwed into a three-eighths of an inch plate, tight, and pulled cold, until it broke in the body at 41,500 pounds. There was one screwed in until we twisted the head off.

Q. Which one was that?

A. No. 5.

Q. Was that pulled cold?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And where did it break then?

A. It broke in the body.

Q. Now, Mr. Slayton, in connection with the inspection of this engine, I wish you would please state to the jury whether or not between the time the monthly inspection was made on November the 11th, 1912, and the time this failure occurred, it was the duty of anybody else to inspect this engine but Engineer Andrews?

By Mr. Hunt:

We object to that because they have gone into it.

Objection overruled.

By Mr. Hall:

I omitted the question.

Q. Now, please answer that question, as to whether it was the duty of anybody else to inspect it but Engineer Andrews?

A. No, sir; our boiler inspectors are required to inspect it every thirty days, once every thirty days, and make a written report.

Q. And between the 11th and the time of the explosion on the 14th, it was the duty alone of the engineer to inspect it?

A. Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Do you mean to say that it was not the duty of that hostler that came in here and said he took a long pole and reached up in there through the soot and smoke and put kerosene oil on a lot of waste, it wasn't his duty to do that, and that he did that voluntarily?

A. We do not require that of them.

[784] Q. That was just his voluntary act, then?

A. He does that for his own protection, in case it was claimed there was an engine damaged.

Q. That is true, that it was not his duty to do it?

A. It is not required.

Q. And when he came in here and testified he did that, he was doing an unusual thing and it was outside of his regular duty, isn't that true?

A. No, sir; it is not unusual; it is common, but it is not required by the company.

Q. He came in here and said he did a thing that was outside the regular line of his duty?

A. He said he did something, and I have no doubt he does it, but it is not required by the company.

Q. Mr. Andrews was not one of the inspectors, except as it was his duty to inspect his engine by looking in there?

A. He is required to inspect all parts of his engine, the

[785] same as all other engineers, by the rules of the company.

Q. I mean he was not a regular boiler inspector?

A. He is not supposed to make a hammer test.

Q. He is not supposed to do any tapping?

A. No; not to go inside the boiler and tap the bolts; but he is supposed to use a hammer where it is necessary.

Q. The full extent of his inspection or duty was simply to poke his head in the fire box and look up and hold his hands over his

eyes?

A. It is his duty to know whether his engine is leaking when it comes in, and if it is, to report it, so that it can be fixed.

Q. Provided he can discover it by the inspection I have just mentioned?

A. He is supposed to know if it is leaking.

Q. If it is leaking anywhere which he cannot discover that way, there may be a difference of opinion whether he could discover it; I say if the engine is leaking anywhere in which he could not discover it by looking in the fire box, he would not be expected to know?

A. We wouldnt expect him to go in the fire box and inspect it.

(Witness stands aside.)

[786] A. KEARNEY.

A. Kearney, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Kearney, what is your line of work?

A. I am assistant superintendent of motive power of the Norfolk & Western System.

Q. How long have you been engaged in work as a mechanical engineer?

A. I had four years at Georgetown (academic), four years at Altoona (mechanical), and later while assistant engineer of the United Railroad of New Jersey, which is a part of the Pennsylvania, I took two years electrical course in Brooklyn. While at Altoona, going through a special course, we have the opportunity, or rather the opportunity is afforded us, to get a special training through all the departments of machinery, blacksmith, boilers, and so forth.

Q. In the Pennsylvania shops?

A. Yes, sir; after that my first appointment was that of assistant road foreman of engines.

Q. Of what railroad?

A. The Pennsylvania, between Philadelphia and Harrisburg. I was there about two and a half years in that capacity. I was in charge of engineman and fireman, the operation of engines on the road, hiring and instructing engineers and firemen in their duties. After that I was assistant engineer on the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore division of the Pennsylvania, and then master me-

chanic at West Philadelphia, of the Pennsylvania, where
[787] they handled all the Pennsylvania interests in Philadelphia.

After that I was assistant engineer at Jersey City for four years, I think. Then they took me back to Altoona as assistant engineer, and after that I was division superintendent of motive power of the P. W. & B at Philadelphia. After about two and a half years or three years I received an offer on the B. & O., and went to Pittsburgh and worked on the Pittsburgh district for about two years as superintendent of motive power, after that I received an offer from the Norfolk & Western Railway Company and I have been here for the last nine years.

Q. As assistant superintendent of motive power?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your various positions that you held, have you had practical experience in connection with boilers and crown-sheets and boiler explosions from low water?

A. After training in the shop at Altoona, in charge of boiler work, and while at Altoona, and since that, of course we have had a good deal of work to do ourselves in the way of constructing and repairing boilers and building up a method of doing the work and making our operation standard, etc. We have had or I have had opportunity to see that work in detail, and being in charge of the design, as we find necessary changes should be made in construction, we apply those or consult with the mechanical engineer, and we work out such changes and apply them to the benefit of the service.
[788] In the matter of low water, I have seen quite a number of cases in my twelve or fifteen or twenty years- experience.

Q. Have you examined the crown-sheet that has been offered in evidence here?

A. Yes; quite a number of times.

Q. Are there any indications on that crown-sheet as to what caused its failure?

A. None at all, to my mind.

Q. As to what caused its failure?

A. Not a thing in the world, no doubt in my mind what caused it.

Q. What did cause the failure?

A. I thought you said did I understand or did I know what it was. Yes, there are indications there showing what was the cause of its failure.

Q. What was the cause of its failure?

A. Absence of water over a portion of the crown-sheet.

Q. What are the indications on the crown-sheet itself that show an absence of water?

A. The indications are very clear on this sheet. We have the color of the sheet, the stretching, the shape of the sheet, the position of the sheet, its relative position in the boiler, the appearance on the water side as well as the appearance on the fire side.

Q. Do these things all indicate an absence of water from the top of it?

A. Very clearly, yes.

[789] Q. Have you examined these bolt heads that have been offered in evidence here?

A. Just in a casual way; yes.

Q. What do they indicate as to the cause of the failure?

A. That they were very hot.

Q. Could they have been as hot as they show they were with water on top of the crown-sheet at the time they were pulled off?

A. No, sir; that would be contrary to all of our experience.

Q. What are the indications on those bolt heads showing that the crown-sheet was overheated and that there was no water on top of it when they were pulled off?

A. The color and their shape and the fracture.

Q. What color do the bolt heads have to show that they were heated to a point of failure, as you say those were?

A. Blue.

Q. Do those have the characteristic blue color?

A. Exactly.

Q. What is in their shape that indicates they were heated very hot at the time of the failure?

A. The fracture is characteristic of a bolt broken under heat, the fibers are drawn as against a straight fracture we would have ordinarily, if broken cold. You observe they are broken under the head, which ordinarily is a strong point in the bolt, and the

[790] bolt heads otherwise show that they were hot.

Q. What does the rounding off of those bolt heads, or the convex appearance of them around the shoulder, show?

A. I have never seen a low water case, and I suppose I imagine I have seen probably twenty or fifty or maybe more, maybe seventy-five. I have examined with the Federal inspectors, and in advance of them probably twelve or thirteen cases; I have made my report and they have never contradicted it. In all such cases they have shown the shape of the head very much like that. I say very much like that, as near as one can tell.

Q. Have you ever seen bolt heads that were pulled off or broken cold, take that shape (indicating)?

A. No, sir; I worked on the test machine while at Altoona quite a long time, and I have never been able to do that; on the contrary, I have seen them blown down under heat, a reproduction of this where we got identically the same result, as far as I have been able to see. I have a nut in my pocket that I picked up while we were making an exhibition test, and it is exactly like that, as to the character of the fracture. I mean showing where the fibers have been separated and pulled out, some pulled and some otherwise.

Q. You say you have that nut in your pocket?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would produce it.

[791] A. I do not want this nut mixed up with any others, because I have had it with me all the time. I have had it with me, in my sight or in my trunk, never at the shope, since that thing occurred; I picked that up while it was still hot.

By Mr. Staples:

Do you know to what extent it was heated?

Witness:

To a point of rupture.

By Mr. Staples:

A rupture of the crown-sheet?

Witness:

Yes, sir; the crown-sheet of this experimental boiler was ruptured like that.

By Mr. Staples:

Do you call that crown-sheet ruptured?

Witness:

Don't you?

By Mr. Staples:

I asked you. Do you call it ruptured?

Witness:

That is, the sheet is not serviceable.

By Mr. Staples:

I asked you if it was ruptured or not; that is all I asked you?

Witness:

Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

We object to your going into an examination of the witness now.

By Mr. Staples:

I am trying to find whether the conditions were the same, and I want to know if that crown-sheet is ruptured.

Witness:

The crown-sheet is not broken, but it is ruptured from its original construction and shape, the crown-sheet itself is not separated in any of its parts that I can see.

By Mr. Staples:

Isn't that what a rupture means?

Witness:

It has broken away from its original position.

By Mr. Staples:

Don't you mean by a ruptured crown-sheet, a broken crown-sheet?

Witness:

If you wish to put it that way.

[792] By Mr. Staples:

Isn't that the usual term?

Witness:

For a ruptured sheet?

By Mr. Staples:

Yes, sir.

Witness:

No, sir.

By Mr. Staples:

Wasn't the sheet in this case torn and isn't that what you are talking about?

Witness:

This sheet was not torn, Mr. Staples; it is merely a question of what you mean by a rupture. If you want to say that rupture means to sever or tear, then this sheet was not torn. But that is a ruptured boiler.

Mr. Hall, continuing direct examination:

Q. You say the boiler you spoke of was blown down from low water in an experimental test?

A. Yes.

Q. And that is one of the bolt heads you picked up while it was still hot, as soon as the sheet had been blown down?

A. I think I was probably the second man there. Mr. Doarnberger says he was the first, so I have taken second place; but I picked that up while he was standing in front of the boiler.

By Mr. Staples:

Is that the same explosion that was made with bolts that had been in service eight or ten years?

Witness:

No, sir; this was a brand new boiler.

By Mr. Staples:

How long had that been in service?

Witness:

I don't know.

[793] Q. I want the jury to look at this bolt head.

A. The reason I am particular about that, I know the question will be asked if I have had it in my sight all the time, and I can swear that came out of the boiler after it was low in water.

Q. You saw that the boiler was blown down with no water on the crown-sheet?

Q. For the purpose of making the test, you say, to see what the conditions were?

A. Exactly so; I was watching it blow up.

By Mr. Staples:

I do not think that bolt is proper, because it cannot be shown the bolt was in the same condition that those were, and we do not know whether it was a good bolt or a defective bolt. The grade of the iron may have been different, the temperature may have been different, and there is nothing in the world to indicate that the conditions were the same when that crown-sheet went down.

A. If you take that position, none of our experience is worth anything.

Q. What difference, if any, is there in the color of these [794] bolts and the ones there in front of you that came out of

this engine, 469?

A. I do not think any one can see any particular difference, they are practically the same. There is one over there (indicating) very much on the same order; several of them are broken and the shape seems to be the same, generally the same.

Q. And the break is in the same general way?

A. Yes, sir; the curve is the same; the general shape is just as natural as can be, as far as I can see.

Q. Can a bolt be forced in that shape and show that appearance if it was broken cold, that is, with water on top of the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. How would you break it, if you could break it, at that point, with water on top of it?

A. You mean under the head?

Q. Yes.

A. You would have to reduce it; you would have to reduce the section under the head and it would not show this fracture.

Q. What kind of a fracture would it show, Mr. Kearney?

A. A clean cut, straight fracture.

Q. Have you had any experience in seeing bolts broken that way, under the head, where the area has been reduced enough to make them break?

[795] A. I did not do it myself, but I got the data and it bears out, it bore out rather, all the calculations that we would have made.

Q. What do the indentations on that crown-sheet there indicate around the bolt heads, as to whether the sheet was hot or cold when it failed?

A. The sheet, particularly in the two forward corners, shows that it must have been very hot, so as to let the sheet embed itself into the head. That is also shown to some extent all over the sheet, and is just about what we would expect even in some colder portions, but it is cut in to quite an extent in the corner of the fire box, the forward end of the fire box. In the rivet line there, is not the hottest part, though the highest, as explained by Mr. Doarnberger.

Q. Does the appearance of the holes there and the threads indicate anything as to whether it was hot or cold when it went down?

A. Those threads show very well that it is pretty soft, but that is not as good as the color line on the water as well as on the other side, or fire side, of the sheet.

Q. Suppose this sheet had been heated so as to cause those bags

between the stay-bolts that are on there, sometime prior to the actual explosion of it, would there have been any indications that the sheet had been burned, when the engine was steamed up and they tried to put it in operation?

A. I do not believe I have your question, but I think I
[796] can answer it—no, it is not clear to my mind, and I will be glad if you will read it again.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. That question is not clear to me yet.

Q. What I mean is, and I do not want you to answer any question you do not understand, if that sheet had been overheated some time prior to the time that it actually went down, sufficiently to cause these bags between the stay-bolt holes, would there have been any indication of it?

A. Naturally, we would expect some indication, although it disappears as the bagging takes place. If I caught your question, that answers it, does it?

Q. If it was burned some time prior, and bagged as much as it showed it was?

A. It might have been.

Q. Would it have leaked?

Q. I will ask you this question: If a crown-sheet is burned or overheated so that it will bag as much as this one is in the center, without going down, will it leak?

A. It certainly will leak.

Q. Could an engine with a crown-sheet burned in that
[797] shape be operated and haul a train for a distance of twenty miles?

A. You could not use it at all.

Cross-Examination.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Kearney, suppose an engine is in the yard and it has not a very heavy fire in the fire box, and very light pressure in the boiler and the water gets low and it is heated there under that condition you would expect the crown-sheet to get overheated some, wouldn't you, from this continual fire there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It would probably bag some, wouldn't it?

A. I do not think so; not with a roundhouse fire as described by you.

Q. How hot a fire do you think it would take to make it bag?

A. It will take a right brisk fire, but not as described by you.

Q. I am assuming now that it does bag and I am assuming for the sake of the question that it would bag with a little fire.

A. Yes.

Q. Now, if that had been exposed by a low fire down in the yard prior to the time that it was delivered to Mr. Andrews and had been overheated there, would you, or not, expect to find the color indications on the sheet there, the same as they are now?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

[798] A. Because he will have used the engine between the time, I understand.

Q. You think the using of an engine an hour would make a change?

A. Yes.

Q. What change would it make?

A. It would change the color on the other side of the sheet.

Q. On which side?

A. On the fire side.

Q. In what respect?

A. It would darken the sheet and show a rather dark soot on the surface of the sheet.

Q. Do you see any dark soot on it now?

A. Yes, up in the back corners.

Q. You say that you can see soot on it?

A. Up in the back corners.

Q. Where it has been hot?

A. Where it has not been as hot.

Q. If the back corners were not heated, in the yard, you wouldn't expect soot to burn off there in the yard?

A. Your question was what?

Q. Never mind what my question was.

[799] A. But I want to understand you.

Q. It is this: I am not talking about the soot being on the part that never was overheated, I am talking about the part overheated in the yard. It would have soot burned off there, wouldn't it?

A. If you assume it was overheated in the roundhouse and then taken out by Mr. Andrews, it certainly would show soot on the sheet.

Q. Do you see any soot on the sheet?

A. I certainly do.

Q. You have got better eyes than the gentleman who was on the witness stand yesterday, haven't you?

A. Maybe I have.

By Mr. Hall:

What gentleman do you refer to?

By Mr. Staples:

Mr. Sample:

Witness:

Mr. Sample pointed out the soot to me and so did Mr. Doarnberger.

By Mr. Staples:

I think Mr. Sample said he could not find any.

Q. You are talking about the part that has not been hot?

A. Yes.

Q. I am talking about the part that has been hot.

A. Then why didnt you say so.

Q. Tell us whether there is any soot there on the part that has been hot?

A. The part that was hot last?

Q. Yes.

[800] A. That sheet has gone down as the result of heating, and the heating has changed the color, as we find it there.

Q. Do you or not find any soot on the part that has been bagged?

A. No, sir.

Q. You do not, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. The only place where you can find soot is on the part that has never been heated, isn't it?

A. I cannot say that. It was the cooler portion at the time of the failure.

Q. That is what I am talking about.

A. You did not say that before. I understood your question to mean that was hot at one time.

Q. I am talking about having been heated in the yard. I think you misunderstood me.

A. Maybe so.

Q. The other portion never had been overheated and the soot will be there?

A. I dont' know whether it has been overheated or not.

Q. You don't see any indication of it, the part where the scr t is?

A. There is nothing there to show it has not been.

Q. Did you ever see a crown-bolt broken in an engine with water on the crown-sheet, under the head, like those bolts are, or broken under the head?

A. You are referring, of course, to the button head bolts?

[801] Q. Yes.

A. I imagine there must be about five million bolts of that kind in service in this country, and I have never heard of one being broken. You might ask, how do we know if one was broken out in California; would it be reported? To which I will say that we have means and methods of finding that out. I have never heard of one in my experience breaking cold.

Q. That is not the question I asked you, Mr. Kearney. You said you knew how one of those bolts would look if broken cold, and I am asking you if you ever saw one break that way or not? Did you?

A. Do I understand you to refer to service?

Q. In service.

A. They are never broken in service.

By Mr. Hall:

I did not ask Mr. Kearney anything about being in service. He is asking him questions on the basis of being in service; I asked him about the testing machine.

Witness:

That is what you asked me.

Q. The testing machine is no different?

A. Not a particle.

Q. You do not think it will be, a particle?

A. No, sir.

Q. How about this drum over here, does the color of that drum look the same as that crown-sheet over there?

A. Not exactly.

[802] Q. It looks a little different kind of an oxide?

A. Yes.

Q. This drum was heated to a bright red?

A. Is that so?

Q. Yes; how hot would the crown-sheet have had to have been to have gone down from low water alone?

A. I am afraid that any answer I might give you in connection

with that, Mr. Hunt, where you will afterwards use the term, will be rather misleading to me as it will to you, because the authorities do not agree as to what the colors mean. For instance, Rankin will start out and refer to a bright red; Kent will call it a dull red; Rankin will start out and call the next a cherry red, but Kent will call it a bright red.

Q. And what do you call it?

A. Which do you want it?

Q. Which would you call it?

A. I should say the sheet must have been on the low side, considerably on the low side of our flanging temperature, which we use in the shop, and which is approximately 1600 or 1700 degrees, or somewhere along there.

Q. Do you or not think the crown-sheet would have to be hotter than you heard the gentlemen describe it here?

A. On going down?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I do not think I can enlighten you on that; I do not know at all; there is oxide on that that is entirely different from what we find of the crown-sheet, due to the way it has been handled,
[803] the way it was heated, quantity of air used in heating; and any answer I might give you would be rather misleading, and perhaps inaccurate.

Q. Mr. Kearney, do you notice any particular difference in the heat to which these bolts were subjected?

A. They are approximately the same; I have heard all of the testimony.

Q. You think they are all the same?

A. I think they are near enough the same. Now, Mr. Staples, in answer to that, I want to say further—

Q. (Interposing.) Don't say anything about bolt No. 9 in your answer.

A. Where you refer to the bolt heads being approximately the same temperature, and to which I agreed, I understand and am satisfied that the highest portion of that sheet, back of the highest portion, the bolts were somewhat hotter than they were towards the side. That is very natural, or rather it is very natural that they should be a little hotter; still I think they were all approximately the same, still those on the side gave way last.

Q. Let me see that bolt that you have got in your pocket.

(Witness hands the bolt to counsel for plaintiff.)

Q. Do you see any particular difference in the appearance of

this?

A. No, sir.

Q. And yet you tell us this bolt was only heated to a dull
[804] red, isn't that true?

A. I don't know.

Q. You heard them say that, No. 9, here?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That bolt, then, according to their statement, never was heated hot enough to cause a failure of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. A dull red?

A. That temperature. I don't know what they mean by a dull red.

Q. I dont' want you to juggle terms with me, Mr. Kearney.

A. Well, don't you?

Q. I want you to tell me some authority that defines a dull red as being sufficient heat to cause a failure in that crown-sheet from low water.

A. I do not know what you mean by a dull red.

Q. Please give me an authority that says it is a sufficient to cause a failure from low water over the top of it. In other words, do you know of any writer on the subject who has advanced that idea, that that degree of heat which would be necessary to render those bolts sufficiently pliable to go down, is a dull red?

A. I dont' know of any; I don't know what a dull red means.

Q. Then I will ask you whether or not if that bolt No.
[805] 9 was heated to a dull red heat, it would be sufficient, or if the balance of the bolt in the crown-sheet were heated to a dull red heat, it would be sufficient to cause them to go down?

A. If a dull red, as defined by whoever is referring to these bolts, as this temperature, it was certainly enough to rupture the bolts, whatever that temperature might have been.

Q. That is not my question. The question I am asking you is whether or not that crown-sheet would go down from a dull red heat? Would it or not?

A. I do not know.

Q. You do not know?

A. No, sir.

Q. You admit that you do not know?

A. I do not know what a dull red is.

Q. Then I want to enlighten you on the subject. Mr. Kent here has defined it.

A. I can tell you what he says.

Q. What does he say about it?

A. He says about 1300.

Q. Why are you trying to throw such an air of vagueness over this dull red?

A. You have Mr. Kent as an authority.

Q. He is a right good authority.

A. Take Barrus or Parsons, they will tell you that the difference in color is so vague that it is only an approximation to start with.

Q. What does Barrus call a dull red?

[806] A. I don't know.

Q. You do not remember whether he is different from Kent or not?

A. He does not give it.

Q. How much does Kent say a dull red is?

A. Approximately 1296; I have read it a half a dozen times since I have been here.

Q. Do you know any author who defines a dull red as being hotter, then?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then we will assume that Mr. Kent is right.

A. No, we won't.

Q. Is he right or not?

A. I do not know.

Q. You do not know he is wrong, do you?

A. No, sir.

Q. Well, just assume he is right if you don't know anything to the contrary.

A. I would rather not.

Q. You will have to do it for the purposes of the question.

A. I don't know what a dull red means. I do know this, that the temperature here is misleading. You ask me if this is a dull red, another gentleman makes an inspection of it and assumes that was beyond a dull red. Now, was that a dull red? If it was, we do not know it. If that bolt (indicating) failed, I know the bolt

[807] and I know it well, it is one that we have been talking about ever since we have been here, and if that bolt was hot enough to rupture like that it must have been very, very hot.

Q. If it was hot enough to rupture like that?

A. Yes, sir; it must have been very hot.

Q. That is your idea?

A. Yes, sir?

Q. You do not think the amount of pressure that the bolt is subjected to has anything to do with the rupturing, but that the heat is the only thing to do with it?

A. If it had been heated and no pressure, it never would have been disturbed like that.

Q. You said the only thing is heat, and not pressure?

A. I did not say that.

Q. I understood you to say, in order to rupture one of those bolts it would have to be mighty hot?

A. You heard my answer.

Q. Didn't you say in order to rupture that bolt head it would have to be mighty hot?

A. What did I say about that?

Q. That is all I heard you say; you must have said anything else to yourself.

A. No, sir; I said it loud enough for anybody to hear. I said if that had been heated to that temperature, as judged by these other men, it does not correspond to Mr. Kent's definition of dull red.

Q. Then you think the fellow who said it had been heated [808] to a dull red, did not know what a dull red was?

A. There was opportunity there to make a mistake in his judgment.

Q. It never was heated to what you call a dull red?

A. No, sir; I think it was beyond that.

Q. You think it was heated hotter than that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you think these other bolts were heated to that same temperature that that bolt was?

A. No; I cannot say that.

Q. Approximately the same temperature?

A. Yes, sir.

Re-Examination.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. This bolt head that has the figure 9 on it, does it show by the way it broke or indicate that it was hot when it did break?

A. Yes.

Q. If it had not been hot at the head of it sufficiently to weaken it under the head, where would it have broken?

A. In the body.

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. What percentage, do you suppose, of the engines in
[809] service today on your road are in service with bagged conditions or corrugated conditions between the bolts?

Defendant objected. Overruled. Exception.

A. You understand that Mr. Doarnberger and I have talked this over and over a number of times; in fact, we were together and I think you came over and talked to us about it.

Q. Yes.

A. The figure given by Mr. Doarnberger, which I think was twenty-five or thirty engines, is a figure that I won't dispute.

Q. It is true that engines in that corrugated condition are in service now and do not leak, isn't it?

A. I want to make myself clear on any answer I might give. As soon as the crown-sheet begins to corrugate, the tendency to leak begins at once. Now, they will leak and we often find it possible to take them up by corking. If they are too bad, and I cannot define what "too bad" is, nor can any boilermaker in this country do it, they will leak more. Now, we have boilers in service and I have seen a number that we have gone over and taken up the leaks as they had corrugated, some corrugate from one thing and some from another, and again some from material on the crown-sheet. That is very clear and just as natural as can be.

Q. And others from low water?

A. I have seen them from low water; in fact, I have been in them after low water.

Q. And they were used and in service, and they are to-
[810] day, are they not?

A. I do not know of any in service; I know they have been put in service, because I have been in them and helped to do the work, and have ordered them back in service.

Q. The extent of the corrugation, or leaking rather, depends upon the extent of corrugation, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, if I understand you correctly, Mr. Kearney, the crown-sheet may be weakened by a previous burning and become corrugated and not leak, and in service now, that is true, isn't it?

A. I think I can answer it this way, just what you want. They will corrugate, and if you are successful in taking up the leaks

you can continue them in service, because the material itself in the crown-sheet has not been damaged or injured except in the shape of the sheet, as it changes from the natural or original arch.

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Doarnberger that heating contracts and takes up the leaking, or that heating expands, retakes up the leaks?

A. I think Mr. Doarnberger thought that you were talking about the bolts while he was talking about the sheet, and when he was talking about the sheet you were talking about the bolts.

Q. Is it contraction or expansion of the bolts or sheet that takes up the leaks?

[811] A. I will try to be right careful in my answer because it is my opinion. You appreciate that the arch is slightly crowned in its original shape.

Q. Or that the crown is arched, which?

A. The crown is slightly arched; I mean that it is very slightly arched, so much so that in putting the bolts in, the bolt heads strike the crown fairly. Now, as long as that sheet is in that shape, in that crowning shape, and is heated, it is my personal opinion and from my observation at the shops in handling engines that the tendency will be for that sheet to squeeze the bolt, because it expands inwardly and goes toward the bolt, while the bolt is going towards it. Now, if that is slightly arched, inverted—

Q. (Interposing.) You mean bagged?

A. Pocketing is better. I believe, and it seems to me any engineer will agree that as that expansion takes place it is pulling away from the bolt?

Q. Pulling away?

A. Downward; because in the arch it finds its relief by increasing the pocket.

Q. As long as the bolt head is in it, it does not expand towards up to the bolt or does not the expansion of the bolt drive it to the sheet?

A. When it is up near a straight line or when it is near its original construction.

Q. Can you put it in that position? That is not true, and you cannot do that to save your soul, can you?

A. I think so.

[812] Q. Explain that to the jury, how you can put it in that position, that the heating of iron will not cause an expansion and drive the sheet towards the bolt and the bolt towards the sheet?

A. This is the arch or a part of the crown-sheet, the rest comes this way, but for illustration I want to take this center part here (witness indicating on blackboard). I want to put two button-head bolts there. Now, this is the pocket (indicating), here we have one side to illustrate first the shape of the sheet in its original construction. Now, as this material between the stay-bolts expands, I believe and I feel satisfied and I think any one will agree with me, that it is going to hug the bolt, the bolt at the same time is swelling and it is meeting the expansion of that sheet over here (indicating). We have an exaggerated pocket as this is expanding. It is certainly finding relief in this direction or in any other direction. The bolt is expanding and is going as far as it can in that direction, at the same time the pocket is taking a position where it can find relief in the pocket without leaving the bolt.

Q. Is that your explanation of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't it true, by your explanation, and don't you make your iron expand here, and denying it the right to expand at this point?

A. It finds relief by coming away from it.

Q. Regardless of the relief which iron finds when you heat it, won't it expand in every direction?

A. Yes; that is so, but it goes in the direction where it [813] gets its relief.

Q. Doesn't it also go in the other direction?

A. It is not getting relief up here (indicating), because it is meeting a bolt expanding and will not make a tight fit.

Q. It will go in the direction (indicating), that direction, as long as it can get relief?

A. Depending on how it hangs, or the extent of the pocketing, down here (indicating).

Q. Regardless of where it hangs, the reason it doesn't go here is because it cannot find relief. It will go in that direction until it gets to the bolt?

A. Unless it finds relief in here (indicating).

Q. That doesn't get any relief in that iron?

A. Yes.

Q. If you crook a nail and heat it, won't it expand here as well as where it is crooked?

A. Yes, sir; but it always getting its relief in the crook.

Q. How about the other part of that nail, as well as this (indicating)?

A. It is, but your joint here (indicating on crown-sheet) is

impaired, your material is out of shape and it will not give you a good joint around the bolt. It does not matter how you expand it, it will not give you a good joint in service.

Q. If you pull this piece of metal from that bolt at that
[814] point and bag it, don't you naturally throw the lower end of this sheet nearer the bolt by pulling the top end away from it?

A. Not necessarily, I do not think you can say that.

Q. Is it possible to pull the top end of it in that angle away from the bolt without throwing the lower part of the sheet closer to the bolt?

A. I do not think it is so.

Q. It is not probable?

A. No, sir.

Q. Would you say it is possible?

A. I do not know.

Q. Hardly possible, is it?

A. Not hardly possible.

Q. If you do not think you can do that, dont you throw a tighter joint here?

A. No, sir; you do not.

Q. I thought you said it was not possible to pull it here (indicating)?

A. I was referring to the lower part.

Q. If you pulled the lower part away by the angle you have there?

A. No, sir.

Q. You never saw a condition like that on an engine?

[815] A. No; but I can make one; you should not criticize my picture.

Q. I am not criticizing your picture, but I want you to draw it so that the jury will understand it better.

A. (Witness here draws it on blackboard.) There, something like that will be better.

Q. Do you desire that joint to be closer there?

A. Any way you fix it.

Q. Fix it near about right.

A. It is just as natural as can be, when you press this down (indicating) you are pulling away from the joint, by pulling this away from the bolt.

Q. The tendency is to shove the lower end closer to the bolt?

A. By expansion I would say no.

Q. By expansion or dead weight?

A. I wouldn't say so.

Q. Didn't you do it by that very act there?

A. I wouldn't say so. I think you have forgotten this (indicating); this has come down by reason of the temperature, and the pressure has pushed it down and it has gotten in that shape and I do not believe that has changed the normal conditions here (indicating), except where it is drawn out to the extent of pulling it away from the thread.

Q. If it is pulled down in that way, don't you get a corresponding curvature of the bolt wherein the thread penetrates the sheet?

A. No; I wouldn't say so, but I would say this, we are [816] speaking of a normal condition, are we not?

Q. Yes, sir; but I imagine that is a little abnormal, the pocketing there (indicating).

A. I wouldn't say all of this is abnormal.

Q. Any pocketing is abnormal, is it not?

A. We are speaking of the drawing.

Q. When you get a pocketing in your sheet you have got an abnormal condition?

A. Yes. Now, that is only three-eighths, and that (indicating) is more than an inch across here (indicating), and down here (indicating), it is about half an inch; it is all exaggerated here, of course.

Q. I am not criticizing your drawing, but criticizing the use of your term "abnormal", and that when you have got pocketing in a sheet at all you have got something abnormal.

A. Yes. I want to make this clear, it is abnormal to the extent of the general construction of the boiler, but we do have engines in the service that have that and we consider to that extent it is good practice, I think that is clear, is it not?

Q. I think so. Now, if I understand you, in order for this pocketing in the sheet to expand in this direction and not in the direction there, you would have to have a pocket lower than any pocketing as shown on that plate, wouldn't you?

A. Repeat that again.

Q. In order for your expansion, your theory of expan- [817] sion, to find the least resistance at the bent position of the iron and not expand here (indicating), and there (indicating), you would have to find a lower pocket than you can put your hand on, on that sheet, wouldn't you?

A. No.

Q. Do you think that there is a pocket on that sheet that would, in your theory of expansion, or in the process of expansion, I mean,

that would go down and not out this way (indicating)? Is that possible?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which pocket?

A. In the natural stretching of that sheet you have distorted all the holes.

Q. But that is after it was blown down?

A. Yes.

Q. But I am speaking of pocketing prior to going down.

A. It is something like that, I imagine; I have no reason to believe otherwise, and further, that the pocketing made it loosen up the joints here (indicating).

Q. And you think the heating of this iron would not tend to shove it out towards the bolt?

A. Yes.

Q. It would?

A. I said that.

Q. I thought you said it would not?

A. I said in both directions.

Q. I understood you to say it would not expand here and there, but would expand there (indicating)?

[818] A. No, sir.

Q. You now tell the jury it will expand there and there also (indicating)?

A. Yes, sir; didn't you ask me if it would expand in all directions, and I told you yes.

Q. I thought you said in the line of least resistance?

A. It would get relief in that direction.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You have asked a lot of questions there about expansion and contraction of materials, from a practical standpoint, when a crown-sheet is burned or overheated to the extent that it bags between the stay-bolt holes, does it leak?

A. It certainly does.

Q. And do these leaks have to be stopped up before it can be put in service?

A. I tried to make that clear in the beginning.

Q. I want you to make it clear again.

A. As soon as the sheet begins to corrugate, you are increasing the opportunity to leak.

Q. I know you have explained that thoroughly, all I want to

know is whether in actual practice it does leak?

A. It absolutely does.

Q. And is it necessary to stop it up before you can put that engine in service, I mean if it is burned to any considerable area?

[819] A. I will answer that one way and you come and ask it another way or you ask something else. There is a condition of leaking that will not necessarily kill the engine, but it must be very, very small. If there is any leak to amount to anything, you have got to stop your engine, though when you asked me if there is any leak, I must be absolute in my answer.

Q. My question is this, if the crown-sheet is corrugated by overheating, without water on it, over an area 3½ feet on one way and 4½ or 5 feet the other way, can that sheet be put in service until those leaks have been stopped?

A. In my experience of fifteen or twenty years, and having been in a number of them, I will say I have never seen it done, I cannot imagine how it could be done.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. If a crown-sheet goes down on an engine at the same time that the water glass shows an inch from the top, or very soon after that, or in such a short time after that that the water could not be consumed in the engine, would that or not, indicate that the water glass was in an improper condition or that the sheet went down not from low water?

A. I know, but it is not a fair question.

Q. Read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

[820] A. Mr. Staples, a crown-sheet cannot go down if it has water on it, that is No. 1. If you ask me the question if the water glass shows there is water on it, it is a false reading, that is No. 2.

Q. And the water glass is not in proper condition?

A. The water glass shows a false reading, and will not agree and does not agree with the guage cocks.

Q. And is not in proper condition?

A. I won't say that.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Kearney, what is the effect when a crown-sheet is overheated and water is put back on the top of it, that does not blow it up, does it, does that cool off the crown-sheet?

A. That has been disputed among enginemen quite a good deal.

There are some engineers today who will tell you that will happen, but the best information I have on that is from experiments made at Altoona by a mechanical engineer, Mr. Collins, and it was afterwards duplicated, the test showing that it would not cause an explosion such as we have here, and as has been described.

Q. But when that other experiment was tried you thought it would do it?

A. That was before my time, Mr. Staples.

Q. That was the general opinion, though, amongst people, that that would happen, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; but I firmly believed Mr. Collins' experi-
[821] ment.

Q. When they tried the actual experiment they showed that everybody was wrong about it?

A. That experiment certainly did.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You are talking about what the general opinion was among engineers?

A. I said enginemen.

Q. That the idea was, that if a crown-sheet was hot and cold water was put on it, that would cause an explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was the idea?

A. But that idea was exploded by Mr. Collins.

Q. And you say Mr. Collins made a test and showed that if the crown-sheet was actually hot and cold water put on it, that that of itself would not cause an explosion?

A. Yes, sir.

[822] J. R. HUBBLE.

J. R. Hubble, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Do you work for the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?

A. Victoria.

Q. In what department?

A. In the mechanical department, boiler inspector.

Q. Have you taken the plate off engine 469?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. When did you do it?

A. This morning about 1 o'clock.

Q. Is that the maker's plate you have in your hand, that came from engine 469 of the Virginian Railway Company?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

I desire to offer this in evidence but I do not want to leave the plate here but just want to read it to the jury.

Said plate is here introduced in evidence, or the reading thereon, as Exhibit I, and is as follows:

"Baldwin, Class 1246-1/4-E-28.

Steam test	220 Pounds
Water test	267 Pounds
Working Pressure	200 Pounds."

[823] Q. You took that plate off that engine about 1 o'clock this morning, did you?

A. Yes, sir.

[824] J. E. KIRK.

J. E. Kirk, affirmed, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You were asked the other day to take two of those bolts and remove the bolts from the plate. I wish you would state how you did it.

A. You have got that kind of mixed up. I took one out one way and the other another way. The one that the threads have been stripped on, I think this is the one (indicating), I held it in my hand like that and hit it with a hammer and it came off very easy. The one that the threads have not been stripped on, I laid it on an anvil, on the square that way (indicating), and tapped it up here and of course that loosened the thread and it came off part of the way, and when it came up to about one-fourth of an inch from the head, it wouldn't come any further, the thread had been spoiled somewhat, then I took it this way and tapped it and it came off.

Q. You pulled it off, in other words?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would the driving it off, the one that the threads have not been stripped on, have a tendency to injure the thread?

A. They had stripped before and they had no effect, it did not take hard enough blow to affect the threads, if they had been holding properly.

Q. How about the last one, the one you did drive?

A. I could not drive it off that way, because the threads
[825] had not stripped at all; it was tight and I had to screw that partly off before it would drive.

Q. Did the driving it off in that way injure the threads any?

A. It may have to a certain extent.

Q. What is your business?

A. I have followed the working of iron and wood for the last thirty years.

Q. Have you had enough experience in iron to know how iron looks when it is heated to a hot heat?

A. I think so.

Q. I wish you would look at these bolt heads and say whether they have been heated to a hot heat or not?

A. Yes, sir; I would say that they have.

Q. What indication is there that they were heated to a hot heat?

A. Well, they are blue.

Q. Does the break, the way they broke, indicate whether they were hot or not when they were broken?

A. The indications are that this bolt was hot when it broke.

Q. Why?

A. The way it broke off and pulled out of the head, if the bolt had been cold—I have pulled the heads off thousands of bolts in putting them in, and I never had one cold but what broke off square right under the head. The bolt to break in that shape would have
[826] had to have been softer down under the head or it would have broken square off.

Q. Why is that?

A. Well, iron will let go at the softest place or the weakest point. Now, the indications are, of this one, that is hulled out when it was a little hotter right there (indicating) that what that bolt was, because it let go at the weakest point, and therefore it must have been hotter there than it was further up.

Q. You haven't had any experience with railroad locomotive boilers, have you?

A. No, sir.

Q. Does the color of that sheet there indicate whether it was hot or cold?

By Mr. Hunt:

He said he hasn't had had any experience.

A. I am speaking of the color from my experience with iron, and the indications of that sheet is that it has been hot.

Q. What are the indications that it was hot?

A. The color of the sheet is one indication, and another indication is that the scale on the water side is all left, about the shape that line has been drawn on there. I have noticed and observed a thing like that, and my first observation was in a tea kettle when it went dry, the scale on the inside will pop off, just like grease would when it was too hot, and then I have noticed it in putting a piece of
[827] flat iron in the forge, when it gets to a certain heat that the scale on the top side will commence to fly, and it has flew up and hit me in the face, until it has all left the sheet with the exception of around the edge and at the corners.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Where are you from?

A. Christiansburg.

Q. Do you live here now?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you lived here?

A. I have been here five years.

Q. Where did you live before you came here?

A. I was in Halifax County, Virginia, three years.

Q. Your native state is where?

A. Pennsylvania.

Q. You never did work for a railroad company or have anything to do around boilers?

A. No, sir; but I have worked around boilers and put in flues.

Q. In railroad locomotive boilers?

A. No, sir; stationary and portable and traction engines.

Q. Such work as a blacksmith would get on portable engines passing by?

A. Yes, sir; I have worked on portable, stationary and traction engines, but I have never had no experience on locomotives on rail-

roads.

Q. You never worked in any boiler works, and the only
[828] work you did was in a blacksmith shop?

A. That is all.

Q. You have done a good deal of carpentering work?

A. I have done considerable carpenter work too, wagon work and buggy work.

Q. Your main work is wagon and carpenter work and blacksmith work?

A. Yes, sir; I never worked on any railroad locomotive.

Q. You undertook to tell us about the soot on that sheet. Don't you know that when iron is stretched that the soot will leave it just the same as if it was heated, I mean if it was stretched?

A. Not clean, no.

Q. It loosens all the soot?

A. But it will be in little spots, that has been my experience.

Q. Wherever it stretches it will loosen it up?

A. Yes, sir; but it will not take it off clean.

Q. There is no reason why it should not drop off then?

A. It will not all drop, it will not brush off either; you can take a brush and you cannot rub it off.

Q. Did you ever try to clean a locomotive?

A. Yes, sir; but not on the railroad; but I have others.

Q. I mean locomotives.

[829] A. No, sir; I never was in one; but I suppose the soot would be the same in a railroad locomotive as it would be in a traction or a portable engine.

Q. You don't know the difference in a crown-sheet, the size of the sheet, the size of the bolts which support the crown-sheet; you don't know whether a stationary engine or a portable engine has sheets of that size in it?

A. I have seen them three-eighths of an inch thick, but not as big as that, but made out of as thick material.

Q. You spoke of a mark around the sheet. Don't the stretching of the iron make a mark around it?

A. No, sir; I had reference to that chalk mark.

Q. You looked at the chalk mark and you say you can tell it?

A. Yes, sir; but I had the line, and the line that was drawn there is, I suppose, within an inch of where I was going to put it myself.

Q. If you were going to put it on, you would put it different to that?

A. Very little.

Q. You would sure put it an inch different from him if you were going to put it on here?

A. You can take that off and I will put it where I think it is.

Q. I believe you said if you were going to put it on you would put it about an inch different?

A. In some places I might make it an inch.

[830] Q. Didn't you say you might make it an inch different from what it is there?

A. It might vary in places, I do not suppose he could put it back in the same place, not exactly; no man living could.

Q. Then even if he follows what he considers the burned area he could not put it back in the same place?

A. Not exactly, to a fraction of an inch, that would be an impossibility for a human being to do.

Q. Then it is just sort of guess work?

A. You know that; you know you couldn't.

Q. It is just sort of guess work, after all, isn't it? You mean it is sort of guess work and you cannot be accurate?

A. You have got to go by the soot on one side and the scale on the other, that is all you can go by.

Q. Do you mean to say that a man cannot take a chalk mark and draw what he thinks is the soot and scale?

A. He can draw where he thinks that water was when it went down.

Q. And you would place it an inch above where he has got it?

A. I might.

Q. Then the line is not so plain that a man can see it?

A. Not that he could follow it to one-sixteenth of an inch.

[831] Q. You said about an inch.

A. It might vary in some places an inch.

Q. Do you think that the man who originally put that mark on there, if he was to go and put it back, would vary it about an inch?

A. I do not think anybody could put a line on a piece of iron like that with chalk and rub it off and put it back exactly at the same place.

Q. There is no such thing as accuracy, when you speak of accuracy in placing that mark on there?

A. I do not think the man who put it on before was exact as to the point of water; that is, to a sixteenth of an inch.

Q. He couldn't tell it and you couldn't tell it, and you don't think any other man could tell it?

A. I couldn't tell it to a sixteenths of an inch, and no other man could.

Q. Why do you jump from an inch to a sixteenth of an inch?

A. Because there is places on that boiler that it would be pretty hard to tell just exactly even to an inch where the water was.

Q Even to an inch?

A. Yes, sir; even to an inch.

Q. Mr. Kirk, the hotter you heat iron the redder the oxidation, isn't it?

A. The hotter you heat it, of course, it changes its head
[832] from dark heat up until you get a welding heat.

A. A welding heat is not a red heat at all, that is a white heat, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the hotter you heat it the redder the oxidization that is left on the iron?

A. You mean while hot or cold?

Q. No; when it gets cold, it has got to get cold before it will oxidize.

A. The burned color that it is called, has some resemblance to red.

Q. Iron cannot oxidize while it is hot?

A. No, sir; after it was cold.

Q. Then you did not misunderstand me?

A. No, sir.

Q. The hotter you heat iron the redder the oxidation, isn't that true?

A. No, that is not correct for the simple reason, if you heat that iron too hot the oxidization will not show in the cold when it is exposed for some length of time. You can take a piece of iron and heat it to a welding heat and—

Q. (Interposing.) What is oxidization?

A. It is the rust that forms on the iron after the heat has left it.

Q. If iron is heated to a red heat, you have your blue scale on it, don't you? That is a fact, isn't it?

A. You mean if it is cool?

[833] Q. Yes.

A. You can heat it to a red heat and welding heat, and let that hot iron stand and let it cool and lay it in the dry for a year and it will be blue one year or two years after you have laid it down.

Q. Then you do not think a year or two would make any difference in the color of it?

A. I mean if it is in the dry.

Q. If it is kept out of the rain a couple of years it won't make any difference in the color of it?

A. Very little difference.

Q. This sheet, they told us, has been kept out of the weather and there were some of them here complaining of the mark being gone by reason of the lapse of time. You don't agreee with them, do you?

A. I tell you I have had experience, and—

Q. (Interposing.) Just say whether or not that is true?

By Mr. Hall:

Let him finish his answer.

A. My experience with iron where it is kept in the dry—

By Mr. Hall:

One minute. Mr. Hunt is making him his own witness on these questions, as I did not ask him anything about that and I do not think he ought to cross-examine him.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

A. I am talking about heated iron that is kept perfectly
[834] dry from the time the heat left it until the time of examination, let that be six months or a year or one day.

Q. If the damp conditions or wet conditions remain away from it, it will be the same?

A. It could be possible that a piece of iron left in a room with the window up, the atmosphere—

Q. (Interposing.) It would have to get moisture?

A. Yes, sir; or it would practically keep its color.

Q. The same color for two or three years, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They tell us that sheet, some day, went down with water on it, and they say that ever since they have had it in a house and wrapped it in paper, if that is so you think it ought to keep its mark for two or three years, don't you?

A. It has, the indications are there.

Q. Some of the mark is there?

A. It is there, it is plain to be seen now.

Q. It wouldn't make any difference whether that was heated yesterday, the day before, or two years before, the mark would be there, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, sir; the mark is there.

Q. And no living man can look at that sheet and tell when that heat was applied there, can he?

A. I see what you are after.

Q. You do?

A. I will answer that question in this way: If that iron
[835] had been heated and allowed to cool in the locomotive with water up on the sheet and reheated, that is a different proposition altogether.

Q. Suppose it had been heated and never allowed to re-cool, how about it then?

A. It would be hot yet.

Q. I mean until it went down, and never allowed to cool until its failure, then you couldn't tell what time the heating took place, could you?

A. It will be practically the same color, or should be.

Q. You said you understood me and you answered me as if you thought I had meant to keep the iron hot up until now, you knew I didn't mean that, didn't you?

A. I know you got it backward.

Q. You knew I didn't mean that, and you answered it as if you thought I did mean that, didn't you?

A. No, that is not what I thought; I thought you were coming to the question of putting water on it, and reheating it.

Q. No, I am not talking about that.

A. Whether I could tell whether it had been reheated after it had been cooled.

Q. Suppose it had been heated by a hostler and never allowed to cool until the accident, the point where that hostler had heated it would mark it plainly today, wouldn't it, if it had been kept out of the weather conditions?

A. Not if he had put fire in it afterwards.

[836] Q. If you did not allow it to cool?

A. It would not make a bit of difference if he put the water over it, if he first heated and burned it before, if he put it in fifteen minutes after the water went over the sheet.

Q. And that mark would still be there, wouldn't it?

A. Not if it was reheated?

Q. Suppose it was not reheated above the temperature wherein it received its mark, how about it?

A. If he put fire in there it would soot—

Q. (Interposing.) I am not talking about soot, I am talking about the mark on the iron, or the color on the iron. Then if it had

been burned and the engineer gets hold of it, you do not think he could look up under it and tell it because the color was the same as before?

A. He couldn't tell by the color because it would be sooted over.

Q. How long would it take to cover it over with soot?

A. Ten or fifteen minutes.

Q. Ten or fifteen minutes?

A. You do not understand me.

Q. I do not reckon I do.

A. I don't believe you do or you don't want to. Now, you take a sheet, a boiler sheet, the crown-sheet in a boiler, and let that hostler in the roundhouse burn that sheet and it did not bag between the stay-bolts in burning it sufficient to loosen the stay-bolts for it to leak, the soot will leave the sheet in the absence of water, he may dis-
[837] cover that, he may find his boiler with water and he may refire it or stir up his fire, and that sheet will soot over just the same as it did before the water had left it and you couldn't tell it by looking at it, if it wasn't bagged or no leakage.

Q. When it went down under the giving way of the bolts that soot would leave it, wouldn't it? It would be bound to do it, wouldn't it?

A. No; by bending the sheet it would not take the soot away.

Q. Then you mean to tell this jury that the stretching of iron won't remove the soot?

A. I mean to tell this jury that the heat of the sheet with water on it, that it won't remove the soot clean, as you can see a blue cast like that (indicating).

Q. Let me understand you. Do you mean to tell this jury that soot put on a sheet fifteen minutes or an hour before, that the stretching of the sheet does not remove that soot?

A. You can not pound it off with a hammer; I have tried to do it; you can strike the side of the boiler and you can not do it.

Q. What is soot?

A. It is the carbon that comes from the coal that gathers on it.

Q. It is the accumulation of the smoke from the coal, isn't it?

A. Yes, sir; and there is a certain proportion of it carbon.

[838 Q. You find soot in chimneys where you burn fire, don't you?

A. Sure.

Q. You find soot wherever there is a fire, don't you?

A. Sure.

Q. And the same kind of soot that forms in fifteen minutes on

a piece of iron would be removed as easily as you could sweep the soot from a chimney, wouldn't it, in the fifteen minute formation?

A. I do not think so.

Q. Do you tell the jury it will not?

A. Let me tell you my experience.

Q. Do you tell the jury it would or would not?

A. I say it would not sweep off very easily, because soot is a hard thing to sweep off, any man that has had anything to do with it will tell you it is a hard thing to sweep off. I have wished many a time that I could sweep it off clean, and I have gone into a boiler and swept it and tried to get it off, and when you come out you are as black as a nigger.

Q. You told Mr. Hall that these bolts looked like they had been heated?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose they had been wrenched from their position on the flue-sheet and fallen into a hot fire, such as is in that engine, what would it do to them?

[839] A. They would be burned.

Q. Would they be just like they are now?

A. If they were left there a certain time, if you left them there quite a while they would be different from that, or they would finally burn up.

Q. Suppose they were left there, what would they do?

A. If you take them and throw them into a fire, they would turn the same color as that after you took them out.

Q. You couldn't look at those bolt heads and say whether they had been laying in the fire, cold or heated?

A. Not by that, but the way they look I could tell that they had been hot.

Q. You couldn't tell when it was broken?

A. No, sir.

Q. And you couldn't tell whether they had been previously heated, or heated on any particular date, could you?

A. I couldn't tell you whether they were off that boiler or not, as far as that is concerned.

Q. And further, you couldn't tell when they were broken, whether they were broken by previous heat, or broken by subsequent heat, could you?

A. No; I couldn't tell that.

Defendant rests.

By Mr. Staples:

I want to ask Mr. Slayton one or two questions.

[840] F. T. SLAYTON, RECALLED.

F. T. Slayton, recalled, for Defendant:

By Mr. Staples:

Q. I believe you told us in Roanoke in the trial in the Federal Court that the water glass is an appurtenance of the boiler of an engine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please state whether or not it is customary among engineers and all engineers in service know that it is customary among them and that they do actually perform the duty of inspecting their water glass and testing it before they start out on a run?

[841] (Manuscript page 841 marked out.)

[842] JOHN DOARNBERGER, RECALLED.

John Doarnberger, recalled, for Defendant:

By Mr. Staples:

Q. What is the lowest that you have ever seen an indication of water having been on the crown-sheet from an examination after a failure?

A. The lowest I believe I ever saw was, I guess it was at a low water test conducted at Coatesville, Pennsylvania, in May, I think, 1912; that was a low water test conducted by Professor Goff.

Q. How low did it get below the top of the crown-sheet?

A. I think it was twelve and three-quarter inches at the front.

Q. How low did the water get on that engine that blew up with Mr. Linkous near Roanoke about a year or two ago?

A. I think it was—I am not positive about that.

Q. I mean that Mallet.

A. Between Bluefield and Walton?

Q. Yes, sir; they had the sheet in Roanoke.

A. If I am not mistaken it was six and five-eighths, but I am not sure now; I cannot remember it, but it was somewhere in the neighborhood of that.

Q. Wasn't it ten or eleven inches?

A. No, sir; I say what I have said, about six and five-eighths

inches.

Q. Didn't you say to us down at the shop, when we were down there that day and when you were showing us these things that the water got eleven inches on that crown-sheet?

A. I cannot remember all that now.

[843] Q. I want you to think about that a little.

A. I have thought about it; I say along about six or seven inches.

Q. You are positive of that, are you?

A. It might be a little more or a little less.

Q. How low does the low water mark that you have pointed out by that chalk line indicate this one was?

A. About two inches.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. In actual experience, isn't it a fact that crown-sheets of engines fail at varying degrees of low water?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What does it depend on as to how low water will get when it will fail?

A. The one that I referred to at the low water test at Coatesville, it was made for the purpose of demonstrating just what low water would do when it blowed clean down from one end to the other. The Linkous boiler, which I referred to, between six and a half and seven or probably six and a half, blew down the whole length of the fire box, and this one that I referred to, has two inches, probably took two-thirds of it; it varies according to the unexposed surface; the greater the surface exposed the greater the damage.

Q. And does the time it is exposed have anything to do with it and the kind of fire it has under it?

[844] A. Yes, sir; there is variations; it depends altogether on how he is handling his engine at the time. A great deal depends on how the engine is being handled; some of them will evaporate more rapidly and get to a point and the lower it goes when it fails the greater the disaster.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. As I understand you, that Linkous sheet, the bolts held that in shape while the water was being evaporated to whatever you found it; that is, your ten inches, those bolts held that crown-sheet up while it was going down and down to whatever it went, isn't that true?

A. If he worked his engine right and his water was getting away from him, his sheet was uncovered from one end to the other, and the whole thing went down, not like this, this was only back about two-thirds of the way, his was clean back. I think that engine has got a three-inch drop and that would give him at the lowest point about three and a half inches below at the lowest point and six and a half at the highest point, and his crown-sheet went down the full length of the fire box.

Q. The whole thing went down, the whole business?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Not until it had twisted in all kinds of shapes?

A. No, sir; it just had an even back.

Q. Isn't it like somebody had crumpled up a piece of paper?

A. No, sir; it was even back the whole length of the fire box, I think it was the eleventh row on the left hand side and about
[845] the twelfth on the other. His boiler was probably on the little leaning grade, leaning to the left, and that made it go down between the eleventh and twelfth row on the other side, I mean on the right side. His boiler went down the full length, but the same as that, it just bagged like that, and it pulled a part of the flue-sheet over like this one and part of the door.

Q. Just answer my question. There is no use in telling so much, and we are taking up time. I will ask you what had been done to that crown-sheet when we saw it? It was crumpled up then. Wasn't it all bagged up and wrinkled in all kinds of ways? Had anybody done anything to it since it was taken out of the engine, when we saw it on the yard?

A. You saw it in the yard?

Q. Yes; in the yards in Roanoke; it was piled up on a sort of a car.

By Mr. Hall:

Who saw it?

Witness:

Was I with you?

Q. I think so.

A. No, I wasnt' with you; I never went out of my office with you.

Q. Either you or one of the other men went?

A. I don't care if it was one of the other men; I never went out of my office with you.

Q. Maybe it was not you.

A. No, it was the other fellow.

[846] Q. You saw it after it was down there?

A. I saw it and I have explained it just exactly how it is; it gave way between the tenth and eleventh bolt on the right side and the eleventh and twelfth bolt on the other side, down in the center, the full length of the box.

Q. I asked you if anything had been done to it?

A. I couldn't tell what condition you saw it in.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. That was on a passenger train, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And being worked very differently from a freight train?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did that make a difference?

A. Yes, sir; he was taking the steam from his boiler at a more rapid rate and then he was lifting his water more rapidly. The faster you run the more steam you are using and the greater evaporation; it is quicker.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. It depends on how fast he was running and how fast the other train was running?

A. He was using his steam faster.

Q. And whether he was pulling up hill or down hill, and the load he was pulling?

A. He was, if I remember rightly, on a level, just about to ascend a grade.

Q. And he never had near as heavy a load as the crown-

[847] sheet had there with eighty freight cars?

A. I don't know about that. He had a tremendous train that morning; he had one steel mail, one combination white; he had three cars, one wooden cafe car, two steel coaches and Pullman. I forget what that train was or what the capacity was, but it was very heavy.

Q. Do you think that passenger train was about as heavy as an eighty-car freight train?

A. No, not quite as heavy; but it is a pretty heavy train.

PLAINTIFF'S REBUTTAL EVIDENCE.

Rebuttal evidence offered on behalf of Plaintiff:

[848] L. S. RANDOLPH.

L. S. Randolph, for Plaintiff, in rebuttal:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Does the heat or temperature of a boiler have anything to do with whether or not it will leak? In other words, will the expansion due to heat close up a hole that would leak if the boiler were cold?

A. I have known it; I have known boilers to leak when cold and take up when hot; whether it was due to the expansion or not, I don't know that I ever followed out any of those cases.

Q. How is it possible to stop a leak in a crown-sheet without taking it through the shop?

A. I have frequently stopped leaks in the stays in the flue-sheet by putting in saw dust or bran or any fibrous thing of that kind; saw dust and bran I always prefer, because that could be put in through the injector or fed through there (indicating), and I have known; in fact, frequently myself out on the road with a leaky fire box, I have gotten saw dust and put it in the tender and fed it through and stopped a leak so we could go on.

Q. How bad leaks have you seen stopped in that way?

[849] A. Several times when the engine was failing for steam we have been able to stop the leaks sufficiently to get up the steam and go ahead.

Q. What would be the proper size ring to put around this here (indicating) to give the same support that is furnished by four-inch stay-bolts? How far apart would you have to have your support there?

A. They ought to have been here and here and there and there (indicating), four inches apart, to get the exact conditions in that respect.

Q. If that had been four inches apart or any of this sheet had been four inches here (indicating), they would have bagged lots more, would they not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would they or not bag more?

A. I am basing that that these were on a three-inch ring.

Q. That is what I understood Mr. Slayton to say these were.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When iron is stretched like a sheet would necessarily

[850] be which failed with the pressure of the boiler on top of it,

what would be the effect of that stretching upon the small amount of soot or scale or something of that kind that might be on the boiler?

A. It breaks it off.

Q. Have you noticed that chalk line around that sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would say whether or not you think that is the line of demarcation between the water line and the sheet?

A. (Witness examines said sheet and chalk line.) I do not think that is relevant to the situation, because the stretching would have made the same line; that line is just at a point up here where the bending stopped. There is a little bending in there, there (indicating) is a point where the bending was great and slight here (indicating), there is a little scale there (indicating), and the results obtained there are practically the same for heating as for

[851] bending.

Q. You think bending would produce that?

A. Bending might have produced it and heating might have produced it; in the result it would be about the same.

Q. I want to know whether or not it is possible for that bolt to have been in that condition that his line on the diagram of Mr. Slayton indicates prior to the going down of the sheet.

A. If that had been hot enough it might have been forced into that shape.

Q. I mean the bolt. Would the bolt be forced into that shape?

A. Yes, sir; I think they could.

[852] Q. While the sheet was on, before it gave way; I mean that irregular shape?

A. Oh, I was going by that one on the diagram. If the sheet had been hot enough to force it in that shape it would have bent the bolt this way (indicating), just as much as on this side, because the pressure would have been the same here as there. In other words, if this snaky appearance had been so (indicating), it would also have been so (indicating) across that way.

Q. Just the same at right angles to it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. This shape here could only have been formed by the coming down of the bolt and distorting it as it comes down?

Q. Explain to the jury then how that could have gotten in that shape?

A. If the sheet had been hot here and hot there (indicating) it would unquestionably be the same temperature on this side as on that

side, so that the bagging must have occurred all around; but if this side (indicating) had yielded, then it would have taken that form (indicating),; that is furthermore shown by the fact that this piece was broken off and pulled over that way (indicating). Now, when that finally gave way the bolt was up there and it was pulled out so (indicating). In other words, this must unquestionably have been the situation; the bolt must have been standing up this way when this was finally pulled off (indicating). (Witness is referring to bolt No. 10.)

Q. I want you to look at that and say whether or not you
[853] think that bolt was broken under the same conditions as the bolt head lying there on the table (counsel referring to the bolt head produced by the witness Mr. Kearner).

A. There are two essential differences, one is that this piece on the end here, that was twisted off, and it is larger than this piece (indicating) and apparently this has been nicked in very much deeper, therefore in screwing the bolts up this one had considerably greater strain on it.

A. This Kearney bolt had very much less strain on it. Further more, the bolt head No. 6 is broken off flush and way down in there, that projection shows it started to break while still up towards the water side of the sheet, where, from all I can gather from a study of this subject, hot bolts in a crown-sheet that has failed nearly always break just on the water side of the sheet, and that projection up there indicates that they started and broke in there.

Q. Near the water side?

[854] A. Far more near the water side than that (indicating).

Q. That is No. 6?

A. Yes, sir; than No. 6.

Q. I don't know whether the jury understood exactly what you said about the nick in this head. You can explain it to them with this bolt head here, and this bolt which has never been put into service and which has a head on it as originally constructed, just explain to the jury what you mean by nicking?

A. In order to get that off and at the same time not screw this up too tight, they cut in here (indicating) with a chisel, right around there and weaken it, and then the wrench is put on it, and that operation is what we call nicking.

Q. Were those bolts there which have been presented here as having been in this boiler nicked or do you see any evidence of their having been nicked?

A. I see no signs on that one (indicating No. 12); there is a

mark on this that may have been caused by a chisel but it looks more as if it had been caused by being hit with a hammer afterwards. I see no signs on No. 8, nor on No. 3. One corner of No. 1 seems to have been nicked a little bit, but I see no signs on the other corners. I see no signs of nicking on No.4 nor on No. 10 or No. 9, though there are chisel marks on them. No. 11 looks as if it might have been nicked on one corner. No. 7 apparently has not been
[855] nicked. No. 5 seems to have been nicked slightly on two corners. I see no signs of nicking on No. 2.

Q. Now, I hand you Mr. Kearney's bolt. Do you see any signs of nicking on that?

A. All four corners seem to be nicked slightly.

Q. Now, I hand you here a bolt with the figure "D. L. W. No. 9", has that been nicked?

A. Very heavily; that is the deepest cut of all.

Q. Mr. Bowden said, I believe, those bolts were put in and twisted until the shank or whatever you call it—what do you call that?

A. The wrench head.

Q. Until the wrench head part of it twisted off.

A. Those all look as if they had been twisted off.

Q. He said that was the customary way of putting it on. If they were nicked, would it or not put a slighter strain on the thread than if they were not nicked?

A. If it was nicked the stress would be less than if it was not nicked; that is, if it was nicked so that the diameter was one-half, the stress on the thread in breaking it would be one-eighth.

Q. Now, if the size of this wrench head which is on the bolt head, is larger than the strength of the thread; in other words, is so large that it will not give way before the threads are stripped, and that is screwed in that way, would it have a tendency to weaken the head of the bolt or injure it or not?

A. It would have a tendency to weaken the head of the
[856] bolt.

Q. And if the threads did not give way, if it is screwed in considerablly tighter than this bolt (indicating), would the crown-sheet becoming heated and the expansion produce any effect on the head, put in this way, the bolts were, without being nicked, and screwed in until the wrenched shoulder twisted off, then what effect would the subsequent heating and expansion have upon the bolt head, the wrenched shoulder not being nicked?

A. The question is rather ambiguous there, and looks as if

there are two questions in one. I think the point is probably this, as I explained in my direct examination: the effect of this tightening down is to put the strain right in here between the threads (indicating) and this head. Now, when that strain comes on, the iron inside there and all up in the head is under strain, if that head gets hot it will tend to crack it off right down in there, right around here (indicating), and as the head is probably hotter at the top here than further down, you would expect the line of least resistance or the weak point of the metal to go back up in the head.

Q. We interrogated you before on your direct examination with reference to screwing the bolts in the plate. Since then it has developed by the testimony of Mr. Bowden, that the method of putting these bolts in was by a wrench and twisting them in until that shoulder broke off. You told us by your examination of these bolt heads that they do not show any nicking. I will ask you first whether the nicking of a bolt on that shoulder weakens the shoulder and the nut?

[857]

A. The nicking of the head here makes it of less strength than it was before it was nicked, and it takes comparatively less effort to twist it off.

Q. Now, then, if it is screwed into the plate, nicked until the head twists off, does that put it in closer proximity or compress it into it tighter than it would if it was nicked?

[858]

A. Closer proximity, and what was the other word?

Q. Compress it into it tighter.

A. You mean this (indicating) and the sheet?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would that have any effect on making an indentation in the plate?

A. It would tend to make a greater indentation in the plate.

Q. Now, please state to the jury if that plate and bolt became heated, whether or not the strain on the head of the nut next to the fire is intensified by the tight screwing of the bolt into the plate in that manner?

A. The tighter this head is screwed against the sheet the greater strain in there and the quicker the bolt will yield when heated.

Q. Mr. Kearney was on the stand and he told us that iron when heated would expand, but that if iron was thinner down in here (indicating) that the expansion of the iron would follow the line of least resistance. Is there anything in that? Is that possible?

A. Before I could answer that I would have to get a definition clearly. Iron will expand in all directions when heated, but if iron is constrained, say this was a piece of iron between my fingers, supposed to be immovable, then when that iron being strained and not being able to expand this way by heat will expand an additional amount that way (indicating) or this way, and if buckled down and not being able to move this way, the buckling will become greater.

[859]

Q. But so long as it could move in the direction of the bolt, would the buckling down have any effect on the expansion of iron on earth?

A. Yes; it would have this effect, that the resistance of the motion of the bolt from this way (indicating) would not have to be so great with a buckled down sheet as that straight one, or in other words, a straight sheet in between there, expanded, would give a greater pressure and have a greater tendency to force the sheet against the bolt than if it were buckled down.

Q. What I mean is this: I don't think you caught me, that if a bolt bends this way (indicating) and the expansion of the iron, until the iron reaches the bolt, could that possibly have any effect upon its expansion?

A. Unless there is some resistance there, it would have no effect.

Q. It would go up against the bolt as tight as it can before it would begin to buckle down?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. To make my question clear to the jury, if a nail is bent and you hit it and there is nothing to confine that nail any where, is the expansion effected by its being bent at all, if there is no confinement to the nail, I mean?

[860]

A. It expands in all directions.

Q. Now, if the ends of that nail are held between given points, then the expansion would come down in the bent shape?

A. The expansion would force the bend of the nail further down.

Q. Were you in here when the gentleman testified about this drum?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see the photographs taken of the bottom of this drum showing some leakage of water and the pressure and otherwise?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose just that amount of leakage had been in the boiler and the fire under the boiler was hot, what would be the effect upon that? Would it be noticeable?

A. The photographs were not particularly distinct, judging from the looks of them; I doubt very much whether it would have been—you mean in this particular case?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. The engineer had the brick arch in the front part,
[861] which makes it difficult to see back, and then there is another matter which comes up, that water at the boiler pressure was at about a temperature of 381 degrees, 380 degrees, Fahrenheit, and the moment it got out in the atmosphere enough of it would have gone into steam to reduce that temperature to about 212, or possibly a trifling above, but that 212 from 381 would have been, roughly speaking, 160 degrees. Now, 160 degrees, between 16 per cent and 17 per cent of it would have been immediately converted into steam, just from that action, and a large portion of the other would have been evaporated right there, evaporated into the fire box and carried into the flues, but I think some of that would have come down back of the brick arch.

Q. Some of the water, you mean?

A. Yes, sir; or on the brick arch, and I doubt very much whether a man could have seen it, but I think on a careful examination he could have seen it if he had been an experienced man, because as it came above the sheet around here (indicating) there would have been a boiling action there that you can generally see.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. You say that the stretching of the sheet would remove the soot and scale?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would the stretching or bending of the sheet change
[862] the color of the iron after it had been heated?

A. Would the stretching or bending of the sheet change the color of the iron?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Not materially. I can answer that further if you want it, and explain it.

Q. That is all I want, but you can explain it if you want to. You say the snaky appearance of the crown-sheet to produce bolts in

that shape that they are in, would be in both ways or both directions length ways and across t?

A. I did not catch the first part of that sentence. Please read the question to me.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. Under the supposition of that sketch?

Q. Your testimony is, Professor Randolph, as I understand it, as you explained here a few minutes ago, that the buckling of that sheet would have been equal in both directions at right angles, length wise the sheet and across and would have forced the bolt in the same shape both ways, is that not a fact?

A. Under those conditions of that sketch.

Q. I am not asking you about the conditions of the sketch.

A. That is what I said, that is what I referred to.

Q. Didn't you say this a few minutes ago, that the buckling of that sheet would be equal in both directions, that is, it would buckle as much on one side of the bolt as it would on the other, and

[863] that the bolt would take the same shape on both sides?

A. That is this way (indicating), and that way (indicating).

Q. Yes, sir; at right angles.

A. Yes, sir; at right angles.

Q. Didn't you say that?

A. I did under the conditions of that sheet.

Q. What are the conditions of that sheet?

A. As I understood them, they were heated all around, uniformly heated all around.

Q. I am not imposing any conditions at all.

A. The question I answered did impose conditions.

Q. All right, I won't impose any conditions at all, and I want to ask you this question, whether or not the buckling of that sheet if it was overheated would be the same in both directions, that is, length ways of the sheet and across the sheet?

A. Uniformly overheated; yes, sir.

Q. It would be the same?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would the arched condition of the sheet as it is normally in the crown-sheet have anything to do with that buckling?

A. I do not think it would effect it.

Q. In other words, you think that a sheet that is arched one way and follows a perfectly straight line the other way, will buckle as much under the same pressure along the arched line as it

[864] will on the straight line?

A. It will if the haunches of the arch are not supported.

Q. Suppose they are supported by bolt heads.

A. Then it would be different, there would be a tendency to greater buckling the one way than the other.

Q. This sheet could not be buckled at all unless it was supported, would it?

A. We are getting a little mixed there.

Q. I am not getting mixed, but I asked you this simple question, whether the sheet could be buckled at all between the bolt heads unless it was supported by the bolts of the bolt heads?

A. No.

Q. It could not?

A. No, sir.

Q. So then, if it is supported by the bolts of the bolt-heads so it could be buckled, it would not be buckled as much on the arched line of the sheet as it would on the straight line, would it?

A. It depends whether the haunches of the arch would support it or not.

Q. Didn't you say it would have to be supported in order to be buckled at all?

A. No; you are twisting from one method of supporting to another method of supporting.

Q. What other method of supporting are you talking [865] about?

A. I am speaking of the haunches of the arch being supported, that is, when the arch sets that way (indicating), it has no strength at all, unless the stress that comes out this way on the end is supported (indicating).

Q. Would it be supported if the—

A. (Interposing.) I haven't finished my answer yet.

Q. All right, go ahead.

A. The other support you meant is a support by the bolts this way (indicating), you see the difference?

Q. Yes, I see the difference; but if you take between any two bolt heads running across that sheet, haven't you got an arch there between the two bolt heads?

A. But you cannot.

Q. I asked you the question if you have got an arch there?

A. Part of an arch.

Q. With the bolts in and the bolt heads on, isn't that an arch that you have got there and isn't it supported at both haunches, as you

say?

A. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the haunches are at the extreme end of the arch, where the arch faces.

Q. Where are the haunches? Isn't it this little arch that we have just described between the two bolt heads?

A. That is the end of the little arch; it is a part of an arch, and a part of an arch has no haunches.

Q. A part of an arch has no haunches?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, Professor Randolph, you are a better mathema-
[866] tician than that; you know more about mathematics than that, I know. Now, suppose that arch has holes cut in it and I am taking a line now following the rows of these bolts, and in order that you may understand it on this sheet. Isn't a straight line drawn through the center of that row of holes across this crown-sheet and arch?

A. A whole straight line, yes.

Q. Now, I want to ask you whether or not a straight line between this bolt head and this bolt head isn't an arch?

A. It is a part of an arch.

Q. Part of an arch?

A. Yes.

Q. Isn't this a smaller arch, taking a straight line between this hole and this one?

A. How is that?

Q. Taking a straight line between the center of this hole and this hole, like that (indicating), isn't that an arch?

A. A straight line cannot be an arch.

Q. I am not asking you whether a straight line is an arch.

A. You said taking a straight line between those two bolts?

Q. I mean a straight line drawn following the circles
[867] here between the center of that hole and this, doesn't that form a small arch?

A. No, I would not say it is a small arch at all.

Q. What would you say it is?

A. I say it was part of a whole arch.

Q. Suppose you blot the whole crown-sheet out of existence, except this section in here that I marked off there with my pencil. Now, I want to blot all of this part here (indicating) out of existence except the space I have enclosed within that chalk mark there.

A. All right.

Q. Now I want to ask you whether or not a line following that arch between those two bolt heads isn't an arch?

A. It could be considered an arch.

Q. It is a small arch?

A. Part of an arch.

Q. And it could be considered an arch?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. All right we have got that far; now, I want to ask you another question

A. But do not let us lead off from that and come back, and what we say of that small one; attribute it to the whole arch.

Q. I don't want to do that; you need not bother yourself about that. Now, I want to ask you this question, if when this hole has a bolt in it, the hole is filled with a bolt with a head under it,
[868] and this hole has a bolt in it with a head under it (indicating), if the bolts on either side of that arch and the head of those bolts on either side of that arch, do not support it?

A. Support it as an arch?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, sir; they do not.

Q. Why not?

A. Because they do not give stress in the right direction; they support it as a beam, a curved beam.

Q. Taking the central point between those two bolt heads and applying pressure on that, which would have a tendency to buckle it? I want to ask you the question whether or not those bolts and bolt heads would not support that as an arch as against that pressure?

A. No, sir; just as a beam.

Q. So the fact that that space between those two bolt heads was buckled in the form of an arch, it wouldn't make it any stronger to resist the buckling effect than if it was straight across?

A. Supported by bolts; no, sir.

Q. It would not make it any stronger at all?

A. Supported by bolts, no.

Q. In order to make your theory good, it would be necessary for that arch to press out on the edges, wouldn't it?

A. Have something to resist it on the edges.

Q. Suppose it did not press on the edges at all, the
[869] haunches of the back arch remained perfectly intact. Now, I want you to tell the jury whether or not the arched condi-

tion would not prevent that sheet from buckling more cross-wise than it would lengthwise?

A. The word intact there.

Q. What do you call your haunches or big arch?

A. What do you mean by intact? You mean did not move?

Q. Yes.

A. If the haunches of that big arch did not move then it would be likely to act as an arch, then your little arch that you referred to, or part of an arch, as I call it, would also act as an arch.

Q. And the buckling would be less in that direction?

A. On account of that arch giving.

Q. Than it would in the other direction?

A. No, sir; to do that there must be this control of resistance at the haunches of the arch to keep it from spreading out.

Q. And if that crown-sheet on each side of it was not broken loose or disturbed along that outer line of bolts and the radial stay-bolts were still in position, then it was supported on the sides of that arch, wasn't it?

A. I don't know what the construction was on the side there.

Q. My question is if that part of the crown-sheet was not disturbed, including the outer row on each side of those bolts to here (indicating), the rest of the crown-sheet with your arch [870] would support it?

A. I cannot tell.

Q. If it was not disturbed, you cannot tell?

A. No, I cannot.

Q. In other words, you mean to tell this jury that if that outer line of bolts was held perfectly intact and the rest of the crown-sheet attached to it and held by radial stay-bolts was in perfect condition and held intact, that then that would not support it?

A. When you say that the haunches of the arch are held in position, then it would act as an arch.

Q. And under those conditions you would expect more bagging lengthwise than crosswise of that sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did I understand you a few minutes ago to say that when this head was left on this bolt, that is, the square head, was burned off?

A. Likely to be.

Q. Just from the ordinary use of the engine?

A. The ordinary use of the engine.

Q. And the operating of the fire against the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is that burned off? How is it gotten rid of?

A. It gradually oxidizes or in some very hot fires they may melt and then it gradually oxidizes and works off.

Q. Just fluffs off, as we call it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Particles of iron drop off and fluff off?

[871] A. Pieces of iron crack in the cooling when the engine is shut down; when it is hot oxide will form when it is shut down and the oxide will crack off.

Q. How long does it take one of those heads to fluff off that way?

A. The head may disappear in a week and it may be two or three months.

Q. By that fluffing off process?

A. I do not think it would fluff off in a week.

Q. But you think it would in several months?

A. Yes, sir; I have seen cases of that kind where sometimes it will last for a year or two, and sometimes it will disappear in the course of three or four weeks or a month.

Q. If that fluffing off process takes place on the heads of the bolts, why do you expect to see where the nicking was in those heads?

A. That is on the head of the bolt, you refer when you speak of the head, I understand you to refer to the square head like this (indicating), and when I answered the question before, that is what I had reference to, not this round head.

Q. So you think there wouldn't be any fluffing off around the button-head bolt at all?

A. No, sir.

Q. You think not?

A. No, sir.

Q. Not even enough to do away with the chisel marks?

[872] A. No, I do not think so.

Q. You do not think so?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why don't you think so?

A. Because it is in here at the point of fracture; if that had been nicked you would have found the point of fracture and that would have been the weakest point. Now, here is one (indicating) that apparently has been nicked, and you see the fracture starts right down in the bottom of the head and one-half of it is on this and one-

half on the piece that went away (indicating). That is the purpose of the nick, to make it break at the point nicked, and you always leave one-half on one side and one-half on the other.

Q. I did not ask you that. You have said that the heat in the fire box of the engine was sufficient to make these square heads fluff off in the button-head bolts?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I have asked you a very simple question, whether or not that same heat in the fire box of the engine would make the top part of that square part or where it is joined to the button-head fluff off enough to remove the marks of the chisel?

A. I beg your pardon; it is not in this case.

Q. Would you expect it to do it?

A. Sometimes, yes, sir.

[873] Q. Now, isn't it a fact that the heat in the fire box is enough to fluff off the whole end of one of these square bolts, when you would expect it under ordinary conditions to fluff off the mark of the chisel at the point where it is nicked?

A. If it was great enough to fluff off the whole end down there, it might be great enough to destroy that nick mark, but if it was great enough to fluff off this portion up here, it would probably leave that.

Q. You did not say anything about fluffing off one portion and leaving the other; you said it would fluff off the whole end?

A. I do not think I used the word "whole".

Q. I do not think you did either, but I will ask you how long it would take to fluff off the square part of it?

A. I had in mind what is the actual or what is likely to take place, in following the technicalities of your question, but it would easily take a point about here (indicating); I think the heat passing through this bolt was sufficient to hold it at a low temperature.

Q. And you think under ordinary conditions that the heat would be sufficient to fluff off the marks of the chisel?

A. No; I do not think so.

Q. You do not think so?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, Professor Randolph, you picked out a bolt, No. 6 there, I think it was, I wish you would find it again for me. (Witness does so.) And I understood you to say that the breaking of this bolt down into the head indicated that it was hot when it was broken, or when the head came off?

[874]

A. I do not think I said that.

Q. Didn't you tell Mr. Staples that a few minutes ago, when

you were recalled on the stand and you pointed out bolt head No. 6 and said that indicated that it was hot when it broke down into the head, it indicated that it was hot when it was broken off?

A. Not when it broke down in the head it indicated that, but that that looks as if it was hot when it was broken off.

Q. So you do not think that that break down into the head indicates that it was hot when it was broken off?

A. This part of the break does (indicating).

Q. Does the break down into the head of any of those bolts indicate that they were hot when they were broken?

A. It depends on the appearance of them.

Q. If this bolt, No. 6, was cold when it was broken off, tell the jury whether it would break down into the head or not, if it was under the crown-sheet with water on top of it.

A. I do not think it would.

Q. Why not?

A. I do not think it would go quite as far, it might go a little way, but the tendency would be to break more uniformly flat across there.

Q. When it was hot?

[875] A. When it was cold.

Q. I asked you when it was hot.

A. I understood you to say cold. It answers the question, I think.

Q. So when it was cold you think it would break more uniformly straight across the bolt?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a little different from what you said the other day about those bolts, as to what they indicated being broken down in there, that they were broken when they were cold?

A. How is that?

Q. Didn't you say the other day when you were on the witness stand that the breaking of those bolts down under the head, that that indicated they were cold when they were broken?

A. I do not think I ever said that; some other things went on around there and that context was different from what it is now.

Q. I don't want to get any context about it. I want to understand what you mean; I want to understand whether the breaking of that bolt down into the head indicates whether the sheet had water on top of it or not, when it was broken in that way.

Plaintiff objected. Objection overruled.

[876] Q. What I want to know is whether or not the breaking down into the head of that bolt and the other heads of the bolts, if you choose, indicate whether the sheet had water on top of it when that break occurred, or not?

A. Read the question.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. There are two breaks apparently here, one across here down into the head over to about there (indicating), and that is the one that goes down into the head, that indicates that when they failed or subsequently that the head was hot, the other break over on this side, just a little portion here holding is not as dark in color, in fact it looks more like fresh air. This has been wet and that fresh air has gotten wet and has formed a red oxide, and that portion was broken, in my opinion, when the sheet had water on it.

Q. I will leave out of consideration entirely color, and I will limit my question simply to this, as to whether or not the concave break down into the head of that bolt indicates whether the sheet had water on it, whether it was hot or cold, that is, the sheet had water on it when it was broken?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. In other words, you think a cold bolt would break down in the head just as well as a hot bolt?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. What do you think?

A. It might or it might not.

[877] Q. You have changed your opinion from the time you testified in this case in Roanoke, from the fact that it would have something to do with it, to it might or it might not, haven't you?

A. No, sir.

Q. I am asking him about No. 6 that was among the nine that were shown him at Roanoke when he was testifying about the bolt heads. Now, I want to ask you, Professor Randolph, if you did not make this statement in regard to them: "These bolt heads indicate that they have been hot, and that they failed from being hot, [878] because they were broken, largely, where the heat is greatest, down in the head." Didn't you make that statement when you testified before?

A. I expect I did.

Q. Is your statement that you make here today that it might or it might not be hot consistent with that?

A. Exactly.

Q. How?

A. In this question you eliminated the color and in that ques-

tion you did not, and you did not bring either one of them in.

Q. Did you say anything about the color?

A. You said to eliminate the color.

By the Court:

You mean in Roanoke?

Witness:

No, sir; right here; he said to eliminate the color, and that changes the question entirely.

Q. Didn't you say in your testimony at Roanoke just as I have read to you that the breaking of those bolt heads down into the heads of the bolts showed that they were hot, and that they were very hot when they were broken?

A. Read the whole thing.

Q. Didn't you say that?

A. That may have been a part of my statement in regard to that.

Q. Now, I ask you if you qualified your statement in Roanoke at all by the color of the bolts, but didn't you say just as I have read to you from the record that the breaking down of the bolts

[879] into the head in that way indicated that it was hot when the break occurred?

A. Under the conditions of this bolt.

Q. Tell us what effect the color would have on it?

A. The color would have this effect, if it was hot we would have that blue color formed; if it was cold the metal would be bright, but the effect of that blue color, it is one of the oxides of iron, would be the rusty corrosion and the rusting by water, but in bright iron it would not rust it and you would have a bright iron turning to red, as you will find in this case.

Q. What bearing would the color have on the way the head of the bolt would break off, whether it would break down into the bolt or straight across?

A. What effect would the color have?

[880] Q. Yes, sir.

A. The color would show the conditions under which the bolt broke.

Q. What does the breaking down into the head of the bolt show?

A. That the metal was weaker down there than it was higher up.

Q. Does it show it was hotter down there than higher up?

A. It is one of the indications of it.

Q. So then, if I understand your testimony now, it is that the breaking of the bolt down into the head instead of breaking straight across is one indication that the bolt was hot when it broke?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then we understand each other that far, do we?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You also say that the color that the fracture is indicates or is another indication that the bolt was hot when it broke?

A. Yes, the blue color. I would like to add a little to that. Had that been broken before and then subsequently heated, that blue color would have obtained.

Q. In other words, if it had been broken cold and subsequently heated, you would have the same blue color there?

A. Yes, sir.

[881] Q. But if it had been broken before and subsequently heated, that would not have changed the nature of the break down into the head of the bolt?

A. No, sir.

Q. So even if the bolt had been reheated and given a color, you still have one indication there that it was hot when it was broken by its breaking down into the head, haven't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would look at that bolt and say whether or not that bolt was hot or cold when it was broken?

End of all evidence.

[882] And this being all of the evidence introduced by either party, the Court instructed the jury, as set forth in Bill of Exceptions No. 2, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after hearing the arguments of counsel, the jury retired to their room to consider their verdict, and in a short time returned into court with the following verdict:

"We, the jury, find for the plaintiff against the defendant, and assess her damages at twenty thousand dollars ($20,000.00), and apportion the same as follows:

To Maude L. Andrews (widow).....$4,000.00
To Arthur A. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Martha J. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Peyton C. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Macon Andrews (child).....$4,000.00

M. F. Harvey, Foreman."

And thereupon the defendant moved the Court to set aside the verdict and grant it a new trial upon the following grounds:

(1) The Court erred in admitting improper evidence before the jury over the objection of the defendant;

(2) The Court erred in refusing to admit before the jury proper evidence offered by the defendant;

(3) The Court erred in refusing to give to the jury proper instructions offered by the defendant;

(4) The Court erred in giving improper instructions to the jury over the objections of the defendant;

(5) The verdict is contrary to the law and the evidence;

(6) The verdict is excessive.

[883] Which motion the Court overruled, and entered a judgment on said verdict in favor of the plaintiff, to which ruling of the Court in overruling said motion, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Rwy. Co.

[884] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 2.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, after the plaintiff and defendant had introduced on their parts respectively the evidence set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, the plaintiff moved the Court to instruct the jury as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS.

1.

[885] The court instructs the jury that it was the duty of the defendant company on November 14th, 1912, to have the locomotive engine No. 469 equipped with a boiler and appurtenances thereof, which were in proper condition, and safe to operate in the service to which the same was being put, that the same may be employed in the active service of such carrier in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life or limb, and if the jury believe from the evidence that at the time said locomotive was delivered to the deced-

ent, A. W. Andrews, at Roanoke, the crown bolts or stay-bolts of the boiler of said locomotive had become burned in service, and weak and unsafe, or had become broken, and therefore weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the ordinary pressure and strain imposed upon them by the steam which would properly be generated in said boiler in the customary service of the said engine, or that said crown-bolts or stay-bolts were improperly screwed in, and improperly adjusted in construction, or were constructed of defective and faulty material, and that as a sole, direct and proximate result of said condition of said stay-bolts or crown-bolts, the crown-sheet of said locomotive No. 469 failed and gave way at a time when there was a sufficient quantity of water over the crown-sheet to prevent burning and injuring the crown-bolts and stay-bolts at the time of said failure, and permitted the water to escape into the cab of said engine and injure the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, while in the performance of his duties as engineer on said locomotive, so that he died therefrom, then the jury shall find for the plaintiff.

No. 2.

[886] The court instructs the jury that it was the duty of the defendant company on November 14th, 1912, to have the locomotive engine No. 469 equipped with a boiler and appurtenances thereof which were in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which the same was being put, that the same may be employed in the active service of such carrier in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life or limb, and if the jury believe from the evidence that the glass water guage was an appurtenance of the boiler of said locomotive and at the time the engine was delivered to the engineer, A. W. Andrews, on said day, said water guage was out of repair and in an unsafe condition due to the valves or holes at the bottom or top thereof being stopped up by lime or other deposits, causing said glass water guage to incorrectly register or indicate a much larger quantity of water in the boiler than said boiler really contained, and the engineer and fireman relied on said glass water guage, and that as a direct and proximate result of said incorrect registration and defective condition of said water glass the water in the boiler became so low that without the knowledge of the engineer and fireman [887] the stay-bolts or crown-bolts of said locomotive No. 469 became overheated and weakened because of a scarcity or absence of water over the crown-sheet, and gave way and caused the crown-sheet to collapse, and hot water and steam to escape and injure the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, while in the performance of

A. Yes, sir.

his duties as engineer on said locomotive, so that he died therefrom, then the jury shall find for the plaintiff.

No. 3.

The court instructs the jury that if they believe the plaintiff entitled to recover in this case under the evidence and other instructions of the court, they shall assess a gross sum as damages which the plaintiff shall recover, and shall apportion this gross sum between the widow and children of decedent according as the evidence shows her or their individual pecuniary loss.

In estimating the amount of damages which you shall apportion or award to decedent's widow, you can consider only the pecuniary loss which she is shown to have sustained, that is, the deprivation of the pecuniary benefits which she might have reasonably received if the deceased had not died from his injuries; you cannot consider grief or wounded feelings or loss of society of her husband, but you may consider the value of such loss of support and maintenance as the evidence shows, including loss of service which she might under the evidence have reasonably received and which can only be supplied by the service of another for compensation.

In estimating the amount of damages which you shall award or apportion to decedent's children you can only consider the pecuniary loss which they are shown to have sustained, or the deprivation of the pecuniary benefits which they might have reasonably received if the deceased had not died of his injuries. You cannot consider
[888] their grief or wounded feelings or the loss of society of their father, but the damages may include such loss of support and maintenance as the evidence shows, including the loss of that care, counsel, training and education which they might, under the evidence, have reasonably received from their father, and which can only be supplied by the service of another for compensation.

The jury should also consider the decedent's age, his habits of industry, earning capacity, and the extent to which he customarily provided for his wife and children during his lifetime.

The jury are further instructed that the amount of damages which they may award the plaintiff, shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars, the amount asked for in the declaration.

No. 3½.

The court instructs the jury that the plaintiff has withdrawn the

fourth count in the declaration, and there can be no recovery, based on the fourth count.

No. 4.

[889] The court instructs the jury that if they believe from the evidence that the failure of the crown-sheet of the engine which resulted in the death of plaintiff's intestate resulted proximately from one or more causes alleged in the first and third counts of the declaration, for all of which the defendant is responsible, then they should find for the plaintiff and assess her damages at such sum as shown by the evidence she is entitled to receive, not in excess of the sum of fifty thousand dollars.

To the giving of which instructions the defendant, by counsel, objected, but the Court overruled the defendant's objections and gave said instructions as offered by the plaintiff, and thereupon the defendant moved the Court to instruct the jury as follows:

[890] DEFENDANT'S INSTRUCTIONS.

No. 1.

The jury are instructed that the mere fact that the plaintiff's intestate was killed by the failure of the crown-sheet of one of defendant's engines, on which he was employed as engineer, does not raise any presumption against the defendant that the boiler and appliances were not in good condition and not safe to operate, and the burden rests on the plaintiff to establish by a preponderance of affirmative evidence, sufficient to satisfy reasonable and well-balanced minds, some fact, or facts, by which it can be determined how and why the crown-sheet failed, and that it failed from a cause for which the defendant is responsible. It is not sufficient to show that the defendant's boiler and appliances may have been defective or in an unsafe condition, or that the accident may have resulted from one of several causes, for one or more of which the defendant is not responsible.

No. A.

[891] If the jury believe from the evidence that the crown-sheet was burned and rendered unsafe after the inspection of November 11, 1912, and that plaintiff's intestate was solely responsible for said crown-sheet being burned, whether it occurred at time of failure or prior thereto after such inspection, then the plaintiff cannot

recover in this case.

The jury are further instructed that if they believe from the evidence that it is just as probable that the crown-sheet was burned by plaintiff's intestate as that it was burned by some one else, they must find for the defendant.

No. 3.

The Court instructs the jury that if they believe from the evidence in this case that the water glass guage was in good or safe condition, they *just* find for the defendant on the third count of the plaintiff's declaration.

No. 4.

[892] The Court instructs the jury that there is no evidence in this case that the injector on the engineers' side of engine No. 469 was out of repair, and failed to properly pump water into the boiler, and that they cannot find for the plaintiff on the second count of the plaintiff's declaration.

No. *B.*

The Court instructs the jury that in order for the plaintiff to recover under the first count of the declaration, the plaintiff must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the crown-sheet or stay-bolts of the engine was weak and unsafe on account of having been burned or overheated in service by some one other than the plaintiff's intestate.

No. *D.*

The jury are instructed that if they believe from the evidence in this case that the crown-sheet which failed and resulted in the death of the plaintiff's intestate, was not burned or overheated prior to the inspection of November 11, 1912, and that thereafter, until the time of the accident, it was the duty of the plaintiff's intestate to inspect and report defects in said engine, and that such duty was not [893] imposed upon any other person, and that the burned or overheated condition of said crown-sheet, if burned prior to the time of failure, could have been detected by a proper inspection of the same by the plaintiff's intestate, then the plaintiff cannot recover in this case.

To the giving of which instructions the plaintiff, by counsel, ob-

jected, and the Court gave instructions Nos. 1, 3 and 4, as asked for by defendant's counsel, and refused to give instructions Nos. *A*, *B* and *D*, as asked for by defendant's counsel; thereupon defendant's counsel amended instruction *A*, to which plaintiff objected, and said instruction as amended was given as follows:

No. 2.

If the jury believe from the evidence that the crown-sheet was burned and rendered unsafe after the plaintiff's intestate took charge of the engine the evening of November 14, 1912, and that plaintiff's intestate was solely responsible for said crown-sheet being burned, whether it occurred at the time of failure or prior thereto, after such delivery, then the plaintiff cannot recover in this case.

The jury are further instructed that if they believe from the evidence that it is just as probable that the crown-sheet was burned solely through the fault of the plaintiff's intestate as it is that it was burned by some one else, they must find for the defendant.

[894] And the defendant amended Instruction No. *B* and offered it as No. *C*, which is as follows:

No. *C*.

The Court instructs the jury that in order for the plaintiff to recover under the first count of the declaration, the plaintiff must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the crown-sheet or stay-bolts of the engine was weak and unsafe on account of having been burned or overheated in service by some one other than the plaintiff's intestate, or on account of defects in the stay-bolts due to the manner of screwing the same into the crown-sheet in the construction of the boiler.

And the plaintiff objected thereto, and the Court refused to give said instruction as amended, to which ruling of the Court in giving said instructions offered by the plaintiff, and in refusing to give defendant's instructions *A*, *B*, *C* and *D*, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffett, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[895] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 3.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness Jerry Walton, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after the witness had testified as follows:

"Q. Tell the jury whether or not that crown-sheet was heated to a red hot heat at the time of this accident."

"A. No, sir; I cannot say.

"Q. Mr. Walton, if a crown-sheet is heated to a red heat, will it make any different light in the fire box than when not heated—the difference between a blue and red appearance, I mean?

"A. I never did see one heated."

the court, over the objection of the defendant, permitted plaintiff's counsel to ask the witness to answer the following questions:

"Q. I will ask you this question: Was the crown-sheet of that boiler so much within the range of your vision in firing this boiler that if it had been heated to a red heat that you would have been bound to have noticed it? Do you understand the question?

"A. I couldn't say positively on that.

"Q. Give us your best judgment on that. What do you say to that?

"A. I suppose you would.

"Q. Now, then, to clarify the record upon this point, do I understand you to say that if the crown-sheet had been heated to a red heat, it was so within your range of vision while firing the engine that you think you would have been bound to have seen it?

"A. Yes, sir.

To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to answer said questions, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 3, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffett, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[897] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 4.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness F. A. Richardson, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to and made a part hereof, and over the objection of the defendant's counsel, the Court permitted the witness to testify as follows:

"Q. If the crown-sheet was red hot, will you tell the jury whether there would be a difference in the glow in that fire box?

"A. It undoubtedly would. I never seen one red hot, but in my judgment there would be; undoubtedly there would be, if the crown-sheet was hot, in addition to the fire you have in there, you have also an arch, and there would be an additional light there and heat to make it light."

To which questions and answers the defendant moved the Court to exclude, but the Court overruled the defendant's motion to exclude the same, to which ruling of the Court the defendant, by [898] counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 4, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffett, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[899] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 5.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness Arthur Scrivenor, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and who testified as follows, with reference to his qualification as an expert:

"Direct Examination.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. What is your business?

A. An engineer.

Q. Tell the jury what experience you have had, what line of work you have been engaged in that brings you in touch with locomotive boilers and kindred questions?

A. When I first left school I went to the Barrow Hematite Steam & Iron Works in Lancashire, England, where I was employed in firing boilers, and gas producers. From there I went to North Greenwich, where they had an experimental station, firing boilers with coal and with oil, they had about seven or eight boilers there, and from there I went to the Unity Iron Works, and from there I came to this country and I was employed at the American Locomotive Works,
[900] then the Richmond Locomotive Works, in the drawing offices, and in 1893 I went into business for myself doing engineering work, and for several years I have been occupied in what is called power plant work, familiar with the stationary boilers particularly, and had a good deal to do with boilers and engines, electrical apparatus and things of that kind. In that time I had charge of manufacturing plants, foundry work and machine shops and so forth.

Q. Have you examined the crown-sheet over there in this case?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

I do not think the witness has qualified as an expert on locomotive boilers and I would like to ask him a few questions along that line.

By the Court:

Very well.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What experience have you had with locomotive boilers, Mr. Scrivenor?

A. You mean in running locomotive boilers?

Q. No, I mean in knowing anything about them.

A. Only while I was in the locomotive works and what I have seen with my eyes at other times since, and what I have read about them.

Q. You were a draftsman in the office of the locomotive
[901] works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers?

A. Except to go to the shops and see how things were carried out and that they were carried out.

Q. To see that they were constructed according to the plans you drew?

A. Yes, sir: I mean going in and getting the details, and I was brought in touch with the work going on in the shop. I do not mean to say we were put in the place of the foreman, because we were not.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers, actual boiler work?

A. No, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the running of locomotive engines or repairing locomotive engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. And your experience in connection with locomotive engines ended in 1893?

A. Any practical experience that I had with them; yes, sir.

Q. How long were you in the drafting room in the Richmond Locomotive Works?

A. From December, 1891, until they closed in 1893; I
[902] have forgotten the month.

By Mr. Hall:

That is all I desire to ask the witness, but we think the witness is clearly incompetent to testify as to locomotive boilers.

By Mr. Staples:

We think he is qualified to speak as to that.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. I will ask you whether or not, in your work in the locomotive works at Richmond, you were necessarily brought in contact with the actual manufacture and building of boilers?

A. Yes, sir; I saw them built every day I was there.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What kind of locomotives were being built in 1893?

A. You mean what types?

Q. Yes.

A. They were older types than are built today.

Q. They were entirely different types of engine?

A. Very much different. The first radial stay fire box, I think, was built at the Richmond Locomotive Works while I was there, and it was designed by the master mechanic of the C. & O. railroad.

Q. And the types of locomotive engine in their size and kind of crown-sheets and stay-bolts have entirely changed since 1893?

A. I do not think the kind of crown-sheet and the kind of stay-bolts have changed very much since the radial stays and radial crown-sheets were started, but I think the type of
[903] locomotive has changed a great deal.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Scrivenor, did the work that you have done require knowledge of the principles which would be applicable in determining from an inspection of a crown-sheet of an exploded locomotive, a failed crown-sheet, as to the cause of the failure?

Defendant objected.

By the Court:

Ask him what experience he has had to enable him to determine that.

Defendant excepted.

A. Ask that question again, please.

(The question is read to the witness.)

A. You use the word "require", I cannot say my work has required that knowledge, but one acquires that knowledge by pursuing that work.

Q. Do you think you are familiar with those principles of mechanical physics which would be involved in determining that?

A. I think so.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

[904] Q. Mr. Scrivenor, have you examined the crown-sheet in this case, lying over there in view of the jury?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Court:

I suppose it is admitted that is the crown-sheet?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir; that is the crown-sheet.

By Mr. Staples:

The defendant produced this crown-sheet as the crown-sheet that was blown down when the explosion occurred and when Mr. Andrews was killed.

By Mr. Hall:

We object, if your Honor please, to the witness answering any question with reference to this crown-sheet as an expert witness, on the ground that he has not shown himself qualified to answer as an expert witness.

By the Court:

That isto save making any exceptions hereafter?

By Mr. Hall:

Yes, sir.

By the Court:

Just note the objection, and objection overruled.

By Mr. Hall:

I want to ask one question. Have you ever examined a crown-sheet of a locomotive that failed from low water?

Witness:

No, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Did you ever see one in your life before you saw this crown-sheet that had failed and was buckled down as this crown-sheet is?

Witness:

I didn't catch that, please read it.

[905] (Question read to witness.)

A. Not unless I saw it on a scrap heap. I mean I may have seen one but I cannot say definitely at any particular place that I did see one.

Q. You cannot say definitely that you ever saw a crown-sheet in your life that was blown out on account of low water?

A. I cannot say it was blown out on account of low water.

Q. Can you say that you ever saw a crown-sheet blown out in any way in an explosion of an engine?

A. I did not see the explosion, but I have seen damaged engines and damaged fire boxes.

Q. I asked you about locomotive engines?

A. I am speaking of locomotives.

Q. You do not know whether any of them were damaged by an explosion caused by low water or not?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

Mr. Hall has assumed as a matter of fact this one has, and I submit that it is not proper.

By the Court:

Go ahead.

By Mr. Hall:

We want to renew our objection to the witness being allowed to testify as an expert as to this crown-sheet.

By the Court:

Unless you have some other objection, this one exception can be to all of this evidence along this line.

Defendant excepted.

[906] By Mr. Staples:

Q. Has your experience made you familiar—that is, your experience and study, made you familiar—with the effect upon iron of heat; that is, the effect upon its holding power, and the effect upon its appearance?

A. I have had considerable experience from its appearance.

Q. Have you made a considerable study of the effect of heat upon its holding power?

A. To some extent."

And the defendant, thereupon, by counsel, objected to the said witness being allowed to testify as an expert witness, but the Court overruled said objection, and allowed the witness to testify, which evidence is fully set forth in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, to which reference is hereby specifically made; to which rulings of the Court in

permitting the said witness to testify as an expert witness as set forth in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, the defendant, by counsel, excepted and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 5, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[907] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 6.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness Arthur Scrivenor, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after counsel for defendant had objected to the testimony of this witness as an expert witness, and after the witness had testified as follows:

"Q. How hot could the sheet have been and retain its present appearance?

A. I couldn't say definitely, as I have no records of my own covering that point.

Q. From your study of the subject?

A. I will state that I have read in Treaties on Heat and such things, that I should say a Fahrenheit heat from 1000 to 1200 degrees.

Q. If that crown-sheet is supported by one and one-eighth inch button-head bolts, what would you think would have been the holding power of those bolts if they had been in perfect condition at dull red heat, per pound pressure, that they could have withstood?

[908] To which question the defendant objected, and thereupon, after counsel for the plaintiff was informed as to the character of the material of which the stay-bolts was made, he amended said question by adding thereto, "I will predicate my question then upon that bolt being made of fibrous wrought iron or special stay-bolt iron—I am talking about first-class material." And the witness was permitted, over the objection of defendant's counsel, to answer said question as follows:

"A. I have not made any definite tests as to the holding power of a red hot bolt myself, but according to Kent, who is considered an authority, I see it on the table here, I have it

myself, the best Lancashire iron which is considered first-class fibrous iron on the other side, it is supposed to increase its strength up to a temperature up to 500 or 600 degrees and then lose its strength down to a limit, I think Kent says something like seven or eight thousand pounds, that is, per square inch. I know that is bright red heat, dull red heat, it would be safe to say it would stand seven thousand pounds."

[909] To which ruling of the Court in permitting the question and allowing the witness to answer same, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 6, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,
v.
The Virginian Railway Company.

[910] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 7.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness Arthur Scrivenor, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, the Court permitted the witness, over the objection of the defendant's counsel, to testify as follows:

"Q. I wish you would state what effect is sometimes produced upon the bolts of a crown-sheet by the fireman opening the box or opening the door and allowing cold drafts to go in?

A. The expansion of the fire box is due to heat, and if cold air is allowed to strike upon the crown-sheet of any kind of boiler, it must contract it, if it changes its temperature at all; that subjects the bolt to unequal strain and sudden strain sometimes, and it weakens the bolt in some cases and in some cases it breaks them. In case cold air strikes it, it causes a usdden contraction, an unequal contraction of the sheet, which has been previously heated."

[911] To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to so testify in answer to said question, the defendant, by sudden contraction, an unequal contraction of the sheet, which

is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[912] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 8.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, hereby referred to as a part hereof, who was permitted to testify over the objection of the defendant, as follows:

"Suppose some sort of metallic substance, or pieces of iron or bolts had been left in there by the manufacturers, and had laid on top of that sheet, would that have had the effect of making it bag, probably?

A. I cannot imagine how anything of that kind would have effected it.

Q. You do not think that would have affected it?

A. I cannot imagine how it would have affected it.

Q. But you think mud or oil might cause it, without the absence of water from the sheet?

A. It might cause it."

To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to so testify, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 8, which is signed, sealed and made a part

[913] of the record this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[914] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 9.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this cause, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions

No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, who was permitted to testify, over the objection of the defendant's counsel, as follows:

> "Q. If the water glass was in good, perfect condition at the time it was turned over to the engineer at Roanoke, could it have been possible for scale to have been deposited on it in such a way as to cause it to register erroneously an hour or so later?
>
> A. You will have to define what you mean by scale, the question as stated there seems to indicate that you mean lime salts, which are deposited from the water. I do not see how it would be possible for those lime salts to close up that guage in an hour or so, if it had been in anywhere near its proper condition when it left Roanoke."

[915] To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to so testify, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 9, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[916] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 10.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this cause, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness, L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and the witness, after testifying that the bolts, which are fastened into the crown-sheet, go up into the wagon top sheet, as it is sometimes called, was permitted to testify over the objection of the defendant's counsel, as follows:

> "Q. I want you to eliminate from your answer the detailing of any experiments which you have made; just give conclusions which you have, applicable to this crown-sheet, and if you think you are qualified to state to the jury what effect of the change of the angle between those sheets upon this crown-sheet in question, the effect upon those bolt heads of the change in the angle between the sheets in this boiler, then you can answer it, otherwise you cannot,

A. I think it would have a slight effect on those bolt heads.

Q. State whether or not the change of the relative positions of those two sheets would probably weaken the bolts or bolt heads along the top of the whole crown-sheet?

A. It would tend to weaken it. I do not think the motion at the head in the crown-sheet on account of the length of the stays would be sufficient to injure the bolts very seriously unless the engine was running a long time."

[917] To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to testify as hereinabove shown, the defendant, by counsel, objected, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 10, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[918] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 11.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness, L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and counsel for plaintiff asked the witness the following question:

"Q. Now, as to the button-head bolts, is there a liability to injury when they are screwed into the fire box where the holes are not tapped at right angles to the sheet, and where the surface of the sheet is curved?"

To the asking of which question, the defendant, by counsel, objected, but the Court overruled the defendant's objection, and allowed the witness to answer as follows:

"A. If your Honor please, I want to change that question a little bit. The tapping—there are two holes to be considered in order to make it clear to the jury, the tapping of one hole at right angles to the sheet, whether that hole is tapped at right angles to the sheet does not matter so very much, but tapping or having both holes punched so that when the stay is put in the heads will come out and bear evenly all around the sheet. Now, if it is not put in so, one side of the

head may bear hard and the other side not at all, and then when you screw it up tightly it will tend to crack the head off."

And the witness was then asked the following question:

"Q. Is it, or not, in your opinion, necessary practice in building locomotives to use a seating tool which faces off the inside of the sheet exactly at right angles to the longitudinal axis of the bolts?"

[919] To which question the defendant, by counsel, objected, but the Court overruled said objection and allowed the said question to be answered as follows:

"A. I think it is advisable, though if care is taken in seating those holes, I do not think it is necessary, or if a washer is used under the head it would not be necessary."

To which action of the Court in overruling the defendant's objections to the foregoing questions (and answers) the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 11, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[920] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 12.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and plaintiff's counsel asked the witness the following question:

"Q. Is it or not true that the sudden letting down of a few bolts throws such additional load on the adjacent ones that they are frequently unable to stand the strain and tear out row by row until the whole crown-sheet is blown down?"

And the defendant, by counsel objected to the substance but not to the form of said question, and the witness answered as follows:

"A. Changing that one word "frequently", and making it "may", I would say yes."

And thereupon, the defendant, by counsel, objected to the answer in

its amended form, but the Court overruled said objection and
[921] refused to exclude said answer; to which ruling of the Court the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 12, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[922] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 13.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness G. W. Mitchell, and offered to prove by him the expectancy of the plaintiff's intestate by showing what the expectancy was according to the standard table of mortality issued by insurance companies, and after the witness had testified that these tables are made up of the expectancy of the average man in good health, and that on account of the employment of railroad engineers being more hazardous than that of an ordinary man, that insurance companies have different rules with reference to the insurance of railroad engineers and will not issue to them the ordinary life policy, the defendant, by counsel, objected to the introduction of these tables of mortality on the ground that it has been shown by the evidence in this case that Mr. Andrews was not a man of average good health and followed a dangerous occupation, more hazardous than the ordinary occupation; but the Court overruled said objection and permitted the witness to testify that the expectancy of the plaintiff's intestate at 38 years of age would be 29.62 of a year;
to which ruling of the Court in allowing the witness to so
[923] testify, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 13, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[924] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 14.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the defendant,

to maintain the issue on its part, introduced the witness A. H. McGhee, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after the witness had testified that he had made an inspection of engine No. 469 as required by the Boiler Inspection Law, and had made a sworn report to the U. S. Government as required by said act, the plaintiff's counsel was permitted, over the objection of the defendant, to cross-examine the witness as follows:

"Q. I will change the form of the question. Did you make a report on engine No. 473 just before its crown-sheet had trouble?

A. When 473 came in there, the night man, he got the engine and then it went to the back shop, and I inspected it there, but I do not know the date.

Q. You still haven't answered my question. I asked
[925] you if you made a report of engine 473 just before, not after this trouble, but before it had trouble with its crown-sheet, the same kind of report that you sent in on 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You reported that in good fix, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When, as a matter of fact, there was stuff on the crown-sheet, wasn't there?

A. Let me understand you.

Q. After you made this report on engine 473, after you made the report, it developed that there was stuff, filings and scrapings, etc., on the crown-sheet of engine 473, wasn't there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. While its crown-sheet was in that condition, your report was in with the Government showing everything O. K., wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; I think it was. I inspected it."

To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to be cross-examined, as above set forth, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tendered this its Bill of Exceptions No. 14, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffett, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[926] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 15.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the witness H. L. Thomas, was introduced by the defendant to maintain the issue on its part, and after the witness had testified that according to the custom and practice that prevailed among the engineers, that under certain circumstances he would put on his left injector himself, and that under certain other circumstances he would direct the fireman to put it on, he was asked, by defendant's counsel, the following question:

> "Q. Mr. Thomas, if an engineer discovered that his water is getting so low as to present the danger of leaving his crown-sheet uncovered, and of the water getting below the crown-sheet, and he wants to put on his left injector—the right one being on—would he call to the fireman to put that left injector on, or would he go across and put it on himself?"

To which the plaintiff objected, and the Court sustained the plaintiff's objection; and the defendant stated that it expected to prove by this witness, in answer to said question that under the circumstances named in the question the engineer would put the left injector on himself and would not trust the fireman to do it; to which

[927] ruling of the Court in sustaining plaintiff's objection to said question, and in not permitting the witness to answer the said question, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 15, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffett, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. o fA. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[928] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 16.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the defendant, to maintain the issue on its part, introduced the witness, N. W. Sample, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exception No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, the said witness was asked and answered the following question:

"Q. Now, the evidence is here that that crown-sheet has been buckled or forced down to the extent of 10¾ inches from its normal position. Now, could that sheet have been forced in that position cold; that is, with water on top of it, by any steam pressure that could be developed by an explosion when the engine was set for 185 pounds pressure? In other words my question is, could that sheet be forced down in the shape it is when the sheet was cold by 185 pounds pressure?

A. No, sir; I do not think it could, because we have a great deal heavy flanging to do like that at the works, and in order to put that set in a plate of that description, or a set anything like it, we have to put the sheet in a flanging press of about a thousand ton capacity."

[929] And thereupon the plaintiff, by counsel, objected to the answer of the witness, on the ground that the witness could not give testimony as to an experiment of the kind mentioned in his answer when the conditions are entirely different, and the Court sustained the objection of the plaintiff's counsel to said evidence; to which ruling of the Court in sustaining the objection of plaintiff's counsel to said evidence, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 16, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[930] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 17.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the defendant, to maintain the issue on its part, introduced the witness John Doarnberger, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exception No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after the witness L. S. Randolph had testified for the plaintiff that he had seen the crown-sheet which had been blown down on the Norfolk Western Railroad near Alleghany Tunnel, and the witness Doarnberger had testified that said crown-sheet was blown down from low water, the defendant, by counsel, asked the witness Doarnberger the following question:

"Q. How did the bolts on that blown down crown-sheet break? Did they break down in the head like these, or square off, or some other way?"

To which question the plaintiff, by counsel, objected, and thereupon the defendant, by counsel, stated that it expected the witness to answer that the bolt heads broke down in the heads of the bolts, or under the heads of the bolts, in the same way that the bolt heads which he had before him and which he has pointed out as being the hottest ones which were broken; but the Court sustained the plaintiff's
[931] objection to said question and refused to allow the witness to answer the same, to which ruling of the Court in sustaining the plaintiff's objection to said question the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this Bill of Exceptions No. 17, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,
v.
Virginian Railway Company.

[932] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 18.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the defendant to maintain the issue on its part, introduced the witness F. T. Slayton, whose testimony is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and the defendant, by counsel, asked the said witness the following question:

"Q. Please state whether or not it is customary among engineers, and all engineers in service know that it is customary among them, and that they do actually perform the duty of inspecting their water glass and testing it before they start out on a run."

To which question the plaintiff, by counsel, objected, and thereupon the defendant, by counsel, stated that it expected to prove by this witness, in answer to the foregoing question, that it is the duty of the engineer to test his water glass before starting out on his run; that the custom is for engineers to perform this duty and to always test their water glass before starting out on their run; but the Court sustained the objection of counsel for plaintiff to said question and
[933] refused to permit the witness to answer the same; to which ruling of the Court in sustaining said objection the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 18, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

Virginian Railway Company.

[934] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 19.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced in rebuttal the witness L. S. Randolph, whose evidence is set forth at large i nBill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and over the objection of counsel for defendant, the Court permitted the said witness, in answer to questions asked by plaintiff's counsel, to testify as follows:

"Q. How is it possible to stop a leak in a crown-sheet without taking it through the shop?

A. I have frequently stopped leaks in the stays in the flue-sheet by putting in saw-dust or bran or any fibrous thing of that kind; saw-dust and bran I always prefer, because that could be put in through the injector or fed through there (indicating), and I have known, in fact, frequently myself out on the road with a leaky fire box, I have gotten saw-dust and put it in the tender and fed it through and stopped a leak so we could go on.

Q. How bad leaks have you seen stopped in that way?

A. Several times when the engine was failing for steam we have been able to stop the leaks sufficiently to get up the steam and go ahead."

[935] To which ruling of the Court in permitting said witness to answer said questions, over the objection of defendant's counsel, the defendant' by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 19, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. Moffitt, Judge. (Seal)

Maude L. Andrews, Admx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[936] BILL OF EXCEPTIONS No. 20.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, after the plaintiff, to maintain the issue joined on her part, had introduced her evidence in chief, and after the defendant, to maintain the issue joined on its part, had introduced the evidence of sundry witnesses, all of

which evidence is set forth at large in Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, the defendant, to further maintain the issue joined on its part, offered the following evidence of C. M. Butler and W. R. Moore, the witnesses being examined outside of the presence of the jury:

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1914, 9:30 A. M.—MORNING SESSION.

At this point a witness named C. M. Butler was sworn for the defendant, and the following evidence was taken out of the presence of the jury, as follows:

[937] C. M. BUTLER.

C. M. Butler, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Mr. Butler, what railroad company are you employed by now?

A. The Atlantic Coast Line.

Q. How long have you been with the Atlantic Coast Line?

A. Eighteen years next February.

Q. Was A. W. Andrews ever employed by the Atlantic Coast Line Railway?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity?

A. Engineer.

Q. What were your duties then in connection with engineers?

A. Employing engineers and looking after their records and keeping track of and handling discipline.

Q. When did Mr. Andrews leave the employment of the Atlantic Coast Line?

A. April the 26th, 1906, was the date of his discharge.

Q. Was he discharged?

[938] A. Yes, sir; he was discharged.

Q. What was he discharged for?

A. For his responsibility in connection with blowing down crown-sheet of engine 370.

Q. Had he burned the crown-sheet and blown it down?

A. The crown-sheet was burned and blown down while the engine was in his charge.

Q. What was his record as an engineer outside of the blowing

A. We did not consider it good; he had had a number of disciplines administered for various causes, some of which were for overlooking meeting orders with other trains; all of which would indicate that he was an unsafe man.

Q. What effect does it have on the character and reputation of an engineer, on his ability to obtain employment as an engineer, to be guilty of blowing down a crown-sheet?

A. In engineer's parlance, it is considered the worst crime he could commit in railroading.

Q. Does that affect his character and standing as an engineer and his ability to obtain employment in that line?

A Yes, sir.

Q. Does it affect it more seriously than anything else?

A. It is even worse, from an engineer's standpoint, than meeting another train; in other words, engineers would rather have anything against them than the charge of burning an engine.

By Mr. Hall:

That is all that we want to ask the witness.

By Mr. Hunt:

Counsel for plaintiff object to the foregoing testimony, because the witness singles out an isolated act which he alleges in his opinion the engineer committed. This testimony is certainly not admissible to show that the probability was that the decedent was guilty [939] of negligence or carelessness at the time of the failure of the crown-sheet which resulted in his death. If the evidence is offered for the purpose of showing the decedent's earning capacity was small, it is also objectionable unless witness is shown to have personal knowledge of the facts about which he has testified and not if he is simply testifying from information he received from others. Therefore, counsel for the plaintiff cross-examines the witness for the purpose of ascertaining the source of his information and the accuracy thereof. Even if the witness had personal knowledge of the specific act of negligence of the decedent, still his testimony should be confined to the statement whether or not he knew the capacity of the decedent and knew whether or not he was a careful workman in the discharge of his duties, and if he thinks not, should so state to the jury whether or not the decedent was a careful workman in his opinion.

CROSS-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Butler, where were you when the crown-sheet was

blown down about which you are speaking?

A. I was in Wilmington.

Q. Where was the crown-sheet blown down?

A. In Virginia, on the Richmond district.

Q. Do you know where Mr. Andrews was at that time, of your own personal knowledge?

A. As an ocular fact, I do not know where he was.

Q. What was the source of your information?

A. The source of my information is that the train sheet showed that he was on that engine; all the records show that he was running it; his own personal statement at the investigation said that he was running it; his time ticket showed his name on it; and there is no question of a doubt of his being on the engine, though I was not there to see him on the engine.

Q. Who made the investigation of the accident?

A. The superintendent, together with the mechanical department, made it.

Q. Who kept the records?

A. It was done under my supervision in the office.

Q. Did you make any of them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which ones did you make?

A. All of them.

Q. Have you them with you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I would like to see them, please.

[941] A. Here is a list of the records.

Q. Does the record which you refer to consist of a letter of November 23rd, 1906, from S. M. T. to Mr. W. S. Teat, M. M., of the L. & N., Blue Ridge, Georgia? Is that the record of which you speak?

A. That is a statement to Mr. Teat of his record furnished him on Mr. Andrews' personal authority, which is just under that.

Q. Do you know whether the L. & N. gave him employment?

A. I do not.

Q. You do not know?

A. No, sir.

Q. As a matter of fact, haven't you heard that they did?

A. I have heard that he worked on the L. & N.; I have heard it said that he did, since I have been here; but I did not know that he had. You will find requests for record there from other railroads.

Q. Did the Virginian Railway Company make an application

to you?

A. They did not.

Q. These are the only records you have got, these letters here?

A. I haven't got a full history of the investigation of each case, the only thing that I can state is that I know from my own personal knowledge that those investigations were made and
[942] those disciplines were administered.

Q. Though not by you?

A. Yes, sir; I issued instructions.

Q. So the investigations were not made by you?

A. No, sir.

Q. And the disciplines were not administered by you?

A. The instructions for the discipline to be administered was issued by me.

Q. But the discipline was not given by you?

A. The discipline was put in effect by the master mechanic, in whose charge he was working.

Q. Where are the records from which you got the data for these letters?

A. I don't know whether they are all on here or not. (The witness examines the file.) They are not; they are on file in the superintendent's office, where the investigations were made; only the results are on this file of papers.

Q. Isn't it a fact that Mr. Andrews stated that at the time the injury was done to the crown-sheet about which you have spoken that the glass water guage showed about two-thirds full?

A. I do not remember the details of the investigation now, but it was made about eight years ago. All I remember about it is that all the evidence presented, the company considered Mr. Andrews to be an unsafe man on a locomotive engine.

Q. That is not the question I asked you.

[943] A. I just simply told you I did not remember all of it; the statement is there, but I do not remember that from my own personal knowledge.

Q. I want you to read here the examination or questions which were propounded to Mr. Andrews and the answers which he made thereto, and see if he does not say at the time that engine went down the left injector was working and the glass guage was two-thirds full of water?

A. "How much water did you have in your boiler?" was the question asked him, and his reply was, "The water glass showed the boiler about two-thirds full."

Q. Now go on, what does he say about the injector?

A. "How long since you had worked the injector?" and his answer was, "The injector was working when the engine blew up; put on the injector at Fox and it had not been shut off; engine steaming good, and no occasion to shut off injector."

Q. The failure of the crown-sheet was a very mild one, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; the engineer was not killed, of course, or he wouldn't have been here if he was.

Q. Isn't it true that it was not sufficiently violent to require the engineer to leave the cab?

A. Yes, sir; it blew him out of the front door, by his own statement. I think you will find he said that in there.

Q. It got so strong he had to go out of the front window.

[944] It says, "Something went wrong with the fire box. I did not know what it was at first, it got so strong I had to go out of the front window; I came back and got a hold of the brake and stopped the train; after I stopped, looked into the fire box, face of crown-sheet was down." Isn't that his description of the accident?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You don't know whether that occurred from low water or not do you?

A. I know as well as anything in this world is known, from all th evidence brought to bear on it, that was the decision of people that were competent to judge.

Q. I asked you your personal knowledge?

A. I haven't any personal knowledge of anything except the facts surrounding it.

Q. I didn't ask you to express the opinion of other people when you in your opinion are competent to judge.

A. You understand a railroad is run and facts are obtained and results are gotten from those facts and we act on the facts we get.

Q. If the glass water guage showed the boiler two-thirds full as Mr. Andrews states, then it did not occur from low water, did it, if the water glass was in good condition?

A. Those are statements that were made by Mr. Andrews. I don't know whether they were true or not; I couldn't say that they were not.

Q. I will ask the stenographer to read the question to

[945] you and will ask you to listen to the question and maybe you can answer it.

(Question is here read to the witness.)

A. As I stated, the fact that he says the water glass was two-

thirds full, the fact that an engineer states that the water glass showed the boiler to be two-thirds full, does not make that a fact.

Q. I am going to ask the stenographer to read the question to you again and see whether the witness can let it soak into his brain, as to what it means. Read the question, please.

(Question is again read to the witness.)

A. I am unable to answer the question. I do not see how I am going to answer it in any different way. You are making an hypothesis, and I cannot answer it any other way.

Q. Well, if the hppothesis be true?

A. If the boiler were two-thirds full?

Q. (Interposing.) Then it did not occur from low water, did it?

A. Why, I don't know where that would put the water on the crown-sheet.

Q. Do you mean to say that you are not familiar enough with the construction of a crown-sheet and boiler of an engine to know the fact that if there is any water at all in the water glass, that the water is three inches over the top of the crown-sheet?

[946] A. I know when there is water in the water glass that the water is over the crown-sheet, but I don't know whether it is two-thirds full of the boiler; I don't know how much water it takes to cover over a crown-sheet as a proportional part of the whole amount in the boiler.

Q. Don't you know that when the water glass registers any water at all that means it has three inches over the top of the highest point of the crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir; if the water is in the water glass coming through the lower opening, it shows water over the crown-sheet.

RE-EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. The fact is that Mr. Andrews was discharged for burning a crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that he knew he was discharged for burning a crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir; he was told so.

Q. And that he applied over his personal signature for that record showing that he was discharged for burning a crown-sheet?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Isn't it true that all the information you have on this subject and concerning which you have testified, is information derived from this pile of letters, data from which was supposed to [947] be gotten by others than yourself, and from records made somewhere in the offices of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad? That is a fact, isn't it?

A. No, sir; I originated most of these papers, myself, and I had other information to get it from.

Q. Those letters?

A. Yes. You understand, Mr. Hunt, that we, in operating a railroad, have to depend on other outside information to get at the facts, and when we get the information and have given everybody a fair chance, why we don't just ruthlessly discharge a man without knowing what we are doing it for, you know. We do not have to see a thing with our own personal observation in order to ascertain facts sufficiently clear to convince us that a certain thing occurred.

Q. We do, we think enough to testify about it, that is just the distinction that I want to get in your head, the difference of making yourself a competent witness.

A. I am here to testify to facts; I came here to testify to things I know have occurred on this railroad. Now, it is immaterial to me one way or the other.

Q. It is very material to this case.

A .That is a matter with which I am not personally interested, one way or the other.

Q. But isn't it true that all the information touching this crown-sheet which you have spoken of, is information which you have gotten from others, and it is information that you do not know about yourself?

A. It is information that I have gotten from others, but [948] I think I know it.

Q. From the sources which you got it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know it from no personal investigation of it?

A. I know it from a personal investigation of it, being present at the investigation.

Q. Were you present when the crown-sheet went down?

A. No, sir; after the crown-sheet had gone up.

Q. Did you examine the crown-sheet?

A. No, sir.

Q. You wouldn't know anything about it if you did examine it, would you?

A. I would know considerable about it; eighteen years in the mechanical department, you pick up a little of something.

(Witness stands aside.)

By Mr. Hall:

Now, we have one other witness that we desire to introduce on this same line, outside of the presence of the jury, and we want your Honor to pass on the admissibility of all of this evidence after we get through.

[949] W. R. MOORE.

W. R. Moore, sworn, for Defendant:

DIRECT EXAMINATION.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. With reference to this matter, I want to put Mr. Moore on and ask him one question. I show you a letter dated at Blue Ridge, Georgia, October the 7th, 1906, signed A. W. Andrews, and addressed to J. S. Chambers. I wish you would please look at the signature of Mr. Andrews there and state whether or not you are familiar with his signature and whether that is the signature of A. W. Andrews who was killed in the explosion of engine 469 on the Virginian?

A. Yes, sir; I am familiar with Mr. Andrews' handwriting, and that is his signature.

By Mr. Hall:

I desire to offer the letter and will read it.

"Blue Ridge, Georgia, 10-7-1906.

"To Mr. J. S. Chambers,
Superintendent of Motive Power,
Wilmington, N. C.

"Dear Sir:

"I have made application to the L. & N. Railway for employment in the capacity of locomotive engineer and I desire to have that company fully advised of my record with my former employers. I was in the service of your company as follows: occupation, engineer, first division, State North Carolina, from April 1st, 1904, to May 1st, 1906. Under whom employed: J. S. Chambers, Superintendent Motive Power.

And therefore request that you forward to Mr. M. P. Teat, Master Mechanic, Louisville & Nashville Railway Company, Geor-

gia, a statement containing all information that you may have as to my personal character, habits and ability, also the cause of my leaving the employ of your company. I hereby release your company from all and any liability for damage of whatsoever nature on account of furnishing the information above requested, which is to be used in determining my fitness for the position mentioned.

Yours truly,

A. W. ANDREWS."

Witness: L. B. Slaughter.

(Witness stands aside.)

QUESTIONS TO MR. C. M. BUTLER.

By the Court:

Q. Did I understand Mr. Butler to say that when he answered this letter he sent a copy of all these letters to the L. & N.?

A. No, sir; I just sent a transcript of those letters; that is the record.

Q. Did you write it yourself?

A. Yes, sir; at least the chief clerk wrote it but signed the superintendent of motive power's name to it.

Q. Who does that letter show it was from, the superintendent of motive power, doesn't it?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. Who signed the letter?

A. I did.

By Mr. Staples:

We still object to the evidence.

[951] Objection sustained. Defendant excepted.

By the Court:

I think, Mr. Hall, you have got the right to show that Mr. Andrews was not receiving the amount of money it has been shown he was receiving, and did not work so many days that they said he worked, and that he was sick and on account of his frail constitution he could not earn the money they claimed he earned.

Defendant excepted.

By Mr. Staples:

We desire the record to show that counsel for plaintiff do not

object to their proving that Mr. Andrews was a careless workman by any person who had actual knowledge of his habits, from being thrown in contact with him.

[952] To the introduction of all of which before the jury the plaintiff, by counsel, objected, and the Court sustained the plaintiff's objection and refused to allow the said evidence, or any part thereof, to be introduced before the jury; to which ruling of the Court in excluding said evidence from the consideration of the jury, the defendant, by counsel excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 20, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 18th day of November, 1914.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge. (Seal)

And at another day, to-wit: May 8th, 1914.

Maude L. Andrews, Adm'rx.,

v.

Virginian Railway Company.

[953] ORDER.

This day came the plaintiff and the defendant, by their attorneys, and upon the plaintiff's motion it is ordered that the defendant file such pleadings as it may desire during the pendency of this term, or within thirty days thereafter; and by agreement of counsel this cause is made a vacation cause, so that any question of law which may arise for the consideration of the Court from said pleadings may be considered and determined during the ensuing vacation, in order that the cause may be matured and ready for hearing at the July term.

We consent to the above.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
By HALL & WOODS, Attorneys;
MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Adm'rx. of A. W. Andrews, dec'd.,
By ABRAM P. STAPLES, JR., Attorney.

And at another day, to-wit:

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v. Case.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[954] ORDER, 5th OCTOBER.

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the defendant Company for plea says it is not guilty in manner and form as against it in the declaration is alleged, and of this it puts itself upon the country, and the plaintiff doth the like. And thereupon came a jury, to-wit: S. W. Kinzie, W. S. Hawley, Walter Saville, Jno. E. Albert, Jr., Joseph Akers, M. F. Harvey, and William Wall, who were elected, tried, and sworn the truth to speak upon the issue joined. And not having time to hear the evidence, the jury is adjourned over until tomorrow morning at half past 9 o'clock.

Before the plea was entered and the jury sworn, the demurrer to the fourth count was sustained, by consent of parties, to the concluding cause of the declaration.

And at another day, to-wit:

Maude L. Andrews, Adm'rx.,
v. Case.
The Virginian Railway Company.

[955] ORDER, 6th OCTOBER.

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having partially heard the evidence, but not having time to fully hear the same, are adjourned over until tomorrow morning at half past 9 o'clock.

And at another day, to-wit:

Maude L. Andrews, Adm'rx.,
v. Case.
The Virginian Railway Company.

[956] ORDER, 7th OCTOBER.

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having further heard the evidence, and not having time to fully hear the same, are adjourned over until tomorrow morning at half past 9 o'clock.

And at another day, to-wit:

Maude L. Andrews, Adm'rx.,

v. Case.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[957] ORDER, 8th OCTOBER.

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having further heard the evidence and not having time to fully hear the same, are adjourned over until tomorrow, Friday, morning at half past 9 o'clock.

And at another day, to-wit:

Maude L. Andrews, Adm'rx.,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[958] ORDER, OCTOBER TERM, 1914 (9th Oct.).

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having further heard the evidence, but not having time to fully hear the same, are adjourned over until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

And at another day, to-wit:

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[959] ORDER, OCTOBER TERM, 1914 (10th Oct.).

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having fully heard the evidence, but not having time to hear the argument of counsel, are adjourned over until Monday morning, October 12th, at 11 o'clock.

And at another day, to-wit: October 12th.

Maude L. Andrdews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v. Case.

The Virginian Railway Company.

This day came again the parties, by their attorneys, and the jury adjourned over on yesterday appeared in Court pursuant to their adjournment, and having fully heard the instructions of the

Court and argument of counsel, retired to their room to consider of their verdict, and after some time returned into Court and presented the following verdict:

"We, the jury, find for the plaintiff and against the defendant and assess her damages at the sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00), and apportion the same as follows:

To Maude L. Andrews (widow)....$4,000.00
To Arthur W. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Martha J. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Peyton C. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00
To Macon C. Andrews (child).....$4,000.00.

M. F. Harvey, Foreman."

And thereupon the defendant, by counsel, moved the Court to set aside said verdict and grant it a new trial because:

(1) The Court erred in admitting improper evidence before the jury over the objection of the defendant;

(2) The Court erred in refusing to admit before the jury proper evidence offered by the defendant;

(3) The Court erred in refusing to give to the jury proper instructions offered by the defendant;

(4) The Court erred in giving improper instructions to the jury over the objections of the defendant;

(5) The verdict is contrary to the law and the evidence;

(6) The verdict is excessive.

[961] Which motion the Court overruled, to which ruling of the Court the defendant excepted.

Whereupon it is considered by the Court that the plaintiff, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, do have and recover of the defendant, The Virginian Railway Company, the sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00) with interest thereon from the 12th day of October, 1914, until paid, and her costs in this behalf expended.

It is further considered by the Court that pursuant to the verdict of the jury aforesaid, that the Twenty Thousand Dollars herein awarded as damages, shall be apportioned as follows: To Maude L. Andrews, widow, and each of her four children, to-wit: Arthur W., Martha J., Peyton C., and Macon Andrews, the sum of Four Thousand Dollars, aggregating the said sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars.

The defendant indicating its purpose to apply to the Supreme Court of Appeals for a writ of error and supersedeas to this judgment, on motion of the defendant, the operation of this judgment is suspended for seventy-five (75) days from the rising of the Court,

[962] upon the defendant, or some one for it, executing a bond before the Clerk of this Court, with security approved by him, in the penalty of One Thousand Dollars ($1000.00), and conditioned and payable according to law.

Memo.—Upon the trial of the case the defendant excepted to sundry rulings of the Court, and by consent of the parties hereby entered of record and agreed upon by the parties, the defendant is allowed forty-five days from the rising of the Court within which to file its bills of exception.

In vacation in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, November 18, 1914.

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased,

v.

The Virginian Railway Company.

[963] This day came the parties, by their attorneys, and the defendant presented its Bills of Exceptions Nos. 1 to 20, inclusive, to be signed, sealed and made a part of the record, which is accordingly done, and it is ordered that said Bills of Exceptions be filed in the Clerk's Office of this Court and made a part of the record in this case.

To the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Virginia:

Enter the foregoing order in vacation.

W. W. MOFFETT, Judge.

November 18, 1914.

[964] I, Geo. W. Wilson, Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for the County of Montgomery in the State of Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of so much of the record as I have been directed to copy in the case of Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, versus The Virginian Railway Company, lately determined in my said Court.

I do further certify that The Virginian Railway Company has caused legal notice of its intention to apply for the transcript of this record to be served on counsel for Maude L. Andrews.

Given under my hand this 2nd day of December, 1914.

GEO. W. WILSON, Clerk.

Clerk's fee for record, $195.00.

A Copy, Teste:

J. M. KELLY, C. C.

The foregoing printed record or transcript of proceedings contains a true and correct copy of the evidence contained in the defendant's demurrer to the evidence and therein referred to as "Exhibit Record," and contains also a true and correct copy of all pleadings, orders and proceedings up to and including the 2nd day of December, 1914, in the common law action of Maude L. Andrews, administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, against the Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, and a true and correct copy of all pleadings, orders and proceedings subsequent thereto is contained in the remaining part of the transcript of the record in said cause, this day certified by me, along with the foregoing, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Given under my hand this 5th day of December, 1916.

CHAS. D. DENIT,
Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Circuit Court of Roanoke County (Virginia), ss:

In obedience to the commands of the within writ, I herewith transmit to the Supreme Court of the United States a duly certified transcript of the complete record and proceedings in the within entitled case, with all things concerning the same.

In witness whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of the said Circuit Court for Roanoke County, in the county of Roanoke, this 5th day of Dec., 1916.

[Seal Circuit Court, Roanoke County, Virginia.]

CHAS. D. DENIT,
Clerk of the Circuit Court for the County of Roanoke, Virginia.

Costs of this record: $14.20.

Paid by A. P. Staples, counsel for Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix A. W. Andrews, deceased.

VIRGINIA:

In the Supreme Court of Appeals, Held at the Library Building, in the City of Richmond, on Thursday, the 13th Day of January, 1916.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY, Plaintiff in Error,
against
MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased, Defendant in Error.

Upon a Writ of Error and Supersedeas to a Judgment Rendered by the Circuit Court of Montgomery County on the 12th Day of October, 1914.

This day came again the parties by counsel and the Court having maturely considered the transcript of the record of the judgment

aforesaid, and argument of counsel, is of opinion for reasons stated in writing and filed with the record that the said judgment is erroneous. It is therefore considered that the same be reversed and annulled, the verdict of the jury set aside, and the case is remanded for a new trial to be had not in conflict with the views expressed in the said written opinion of the Court. It is further considered that the Plaintiff in error recover of the defendant in error its cost by it expended about the prosecution of its writ of error and supersedeas aforesaid here. This is ordered to be certified to the said Circuit Court.

A Copy.

H. STEWART JONES, *C. C.*

Opinion of Court of Appeals.

Circuit Court of Montgomery County.

Opinion by Judge Stafford G. Whittle.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY

v.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased.

RICHMOND, VA., January 13, 1916.

The right of the defendant in error, who was the plaintiff below, to recover damages for the death of her intestate was rested upon the grounds stated in a declaration containing four counts. The Court sustained a demurrer to the fourth count, and, without objection, instructed the jury that there was no evidence to sustain the second Court so that the case was tried on the first and third counts.

(1) The first count alleges that the stay-bolts supporting the crown-sheet were made of defective material, and that the workmanship was faulty; and that they had been weakened and rendered unsafe by previously having been burned. (2) And the third count alleges that the glass water-gauge was out of repair and in an unsafe condition, the valves therein being stopped up with lime, trash or other deposits, and improperly registered the quantity of water in the boiler. Both these counts are founded on an act of Congress approved February 17, 1911, entitled, "An act to promote the safety of employes and travelers by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto."

The following is an outline narrative of the salient facts: The engine which is the subject of investigation was one of ten engines built for the defendant by the Baldwin Locomotive Works, which is one of the largest and most reliable manufactories of engines in the United States. At the time of the accident the engine was practically new, having been used for the first time in May, 1912. It

was constructed with great care, both with respect to material and workmanship; and, during the course of construction, in every detail, was subjected to rigid inspection by experienced inspectors detailed by the defendant for that service. The specifications called for a crown-sheet for the engine with a margin of safety of 13.3 under steam pressu-e of 200 pounds. The engine was being operated with a steam pressure of 185 pounds, and, properly handled, was capable of withstanding a pressure of about sixteen times the pressure to which it was subjected at the time of the accident. The inspectors tested the tensil strength of the materials used in the crown-sheet and stay-bolts before they were put in the engine, and found them of the required strength. After the engine had been completed, the boiler was thoroughly tested with water and steam, and likewise proved satisfactory. It was then washed out with soda and cleansed of grease, oil and other foreign substances used in, and which collected during, the course of construction. The engine was practically in the control of plaintiff's intestate and run by him during the entire time it was in operation. On November 11, 1912, three days prior to the accident, it was inspected by government inspectors under the act of Congress, which inspection showed that the engine boiler and appurtenances were in perfect condition. From the time of that inspection until the explosion, the engine was exclusively operated by Engineer Andrews. In the interval he made two trips from Princeton, West Virginia, to Roanoke, Virginia, and return, and had run the engine back to Roanoke. On November 14, 1912, at 9:30 p. m., he left the latter city for Princeton, pulling three loaded cars and seventy-nine empties, and had proceeded about eighteen miles on his journey when the explosion happened. In addition to the inspections provided for by the Boiler Act, the defendant enjoined upon the engineer the duty to inspect his own engine, and at the end of each run to make a written report of its condition. Accordingly, in obedience to that rule, when the engineer arrived at Roanoke on the morning of November 14, he made his report that he had carefully inspected the engine and its appurtenances and found it in good condition, with the exception of certain unimportant defects to which attention was called, and which were speedily repaired. There was no suggestion in the report of any defect in the crown-sheet. Moreover, on the night of the accident, the hostler examined the crown-sheet before turning over the engine to the engineer, and discovered no defects in it; after the engineer took charge of the engine, shortly before setting out from Roanoke, he again examined the crown-sheet.

It thus appears from the undisputed evidence that at 9:30 p. m., the time of departure for Princeton, just one hour before the explosion, the defendant had complied with every requirement of the Boiler Act, and the locomotive engine, boiler and appurtenances measured up to statutory standard.

After the explosion the engine was hauled to Princeton by another engine. The cab was boxed up as required by the Boiler Act, and the engine, boiler and appurtenances remained in the condition in which they were found after the explosion until November 16

and 17, when they were inspected by two government inspectors set out for that purpose by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These officials made their report and also testified at the trial, and proved that apart from the injury caused by the explosion the boiler and all its appurtenances, including the injectors which carried water from the tank to the boiler, and the glass water gauge were in perfect condition. These inspectors were furthermore of opinion that the explosion was unquestionably due to low water in the boiler. This opinion was concurred in by a number of other witnesses of wide experience in the observation of crownsheets blown down from low water in the boiler. Indeed, the concensus of opinion — witnesses on both sides was that the crown-sheet had been burned—that is to say, it had been heated with no water on top of it—though the expert witnesses for the plaintiff testified that the color of the crown-sheet indicated that it had been burned prior to the time of failure, and had water on it when actually failed. They were also of opinion that the presence of oil, or perchance some other foreign matter in the boiler, made it possible to burn the crown-sheet though covered with water. But these theories were refuted by the positive evidence that the crown-sheet had not previously been burned, and that there was no oil or other foreign substance in the boiler at the time of the failure. As remarked, the engine left Roanoke an hour before the accident in good condition, and there was no evidence of leakage during the short run of eighteen miles, which would necessarily have been the case had the theory of the experts that the crown-sheet had been previously burned been correct.

It is insisted on behalf of the plaintiff that in legal intendment the Boiler Act is not to be distinguished from the original Safety Appliance Act of March, 1893, and amendments, and the Employers' Liability Act of 1908. These latter acts have been construed by the Supreme Court of the United States to impose upon the carrier the absolute duty to provide and maintain proper couplers and other appliances therein mentioned at all times and under all circumstances. St. L. I. M. & S. Ry. Co. v. Taylor, 210 U. S. 281, 52 L. Ed. 1061; C. B. & Q. R. Co. v. U. S., 220 U. S. 559, 55 L. Ed. 582; Delk v. St. L. & S. F. R. Co., 220 U. S. 580; and Grand Trunk Ry. Co. v. Lindsay, 233 U. S., 42.

It will be observed that the safety appliances considered in the foregoing and analogous cases, either work automatically, as couplers which operate by impact, or else are simple contrivances, as drawbars and the like, which are the objects rather than the subjects of action, and when once placed in position remain intact and discharge their functions until changed by some active agency. A locomotive engine, on the other hand, however perfect its condition, may be, in its operation calls for the continuous exercise of a high degree of skill and experience, and the constant supervision and attention of the engineer. In other words, the two classes of instrumentalities are so inherently diverse in character and use that rules which would be reasonable and appropriate in respect to the one class would be impossible of practical application to the other. The avowed object of the Boiler Act, it is true, is to promote the safety of employees

and travelers, and to that end section 2 declares that from and after July 1, 1911, it shall be unlawful for any common carrier to use any locomotive engine propelled by steam power in moving interstate or foreign traffic unless the boiler and appurtenances thereof are in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which the same is put, that the same may be employed the active service of such carrier in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life and limb. When, therefore, the carrier has discharged his statutory duty to the engineer by turning over to him a locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate, it is not answerable to the engineer as an insurer of his safety throughout the run; and in order for his personal representative to maintain an action for his death caused by the explosion of the boiler, the burden rests upon the plaintiff to show that the defendant has been guilty of negligence charged in the declaration.

The occupants of the cab at the time of the accident were the engineer, Andrews, a brakeman, Lucas, and the fireman, Jerre Walton. The two former were killed, and the plaintiff sought to prove by Walton that the explosion resulted from defects in the crown-sheet or stay-bolts which existed prior to the accident. This witness admittedly had no familiarly with that type of engine, that being his first trip on an engine of that class; and, not to mention distractions incident to the discharge of his duties as fireman, his only opportunity for acquiring information concerning the engine, boiler and appurtenances covered an hour in time and eighteen miles in distance. He never saw the crown-sheet until after the explosion, and did not know the height of the fire-box door, or what position he would have to assume to see the crown-sheet, or whether there was a brick arch inside the engine which would obstruct the view of the crown-sheet. Nevertheless, he was permitted to express the opinion that if the crown-sheet had been burnt on that trip and made red hot there would have been a different glow in the fire-box. The opinion evidence of this witness was altogether speculative and plainly inadmissible. Virginia-Carolina Chem. Co. v. Knight, 106 Va. 674, 677, 1 Va. App. 11; Norfolk & Portsmouth Traction Co. v. Ellington, 108, Va. 245, 2 Va. App. 198.

The same is true of the evidence of the witness Richardson on the same point. Walton, also testified that the injector was working properly and supplying water to the boiler, basing his opinion on the sound it gave forth; yet he admitted that he was without experience as to injectors of that sort. He testified that the injectors and pipes leading from them into the boiler were located inside the cab, when in fact they were on the outside. Other witnesses for plaintiff testified that it required familiarity with this class of engines and ejectors for one to determine from the sound whether they were working properly or not, and that could not be done when the cab window was closed. Walton moreover testified that the water glass showed water in the boiler when the train left Roanoke, and from then to the Norfolk and Western overhead bridge, and also at Singer's tank, where he noticed it for the last time. The distance from Singer's tank to the point of accident is two and one-half miles, and

a train moving at eighteen miles an hour would cover that distance in eight minutes and twenty seconds.

It was also in evidence that though the injector was in good order, it would not automatically supply the engine with water, but to accomplish that result it was necessary for the engineer to properly adjust the valves introducing water and steam into the injector, and unless that was done the water would not be forced into the boiler but would escape through the waste pipe; and, furthermore, if that precaution was neglected, that the interval of time which elapsed between Singer's tank and the point of accident was sufficient for the crown-sheet to become exposed from lack of water, in which event the explosion would have been inevitable.

We shall not extend this opinion by entering upon a detailed analysis of the evidence of expert witnesses for the plaintiff. The trial court allowed great latitude in their examination, and numerous theories were advanced as to what possibly might have caused the accident. However, it is enough to say that a painstaking examination of this evidence shows that the opinions of the witnesses were neither founded upon facts within their own knowledge, or established by other evidence in the case. Hence, their conclusions were matters of speculation, and possessed no evidencial value. Such statements violate the fundamental principle (so often accentuated in opinions of this Court) that an inference can not be drawn from a presumption. A verdict resting upon such foundation is not the fruit of evidence, but of conjecture and can not be upheld.

"Before the opinion of an expert, based on facts to which he has not himself testified, can be admitted, he must fully understand the facts already proved, and his testimony must come in response to a hypothetical question embodying the evidence." City of Richmond v. Wood 109 Va. 75, 2 Va. App. 777.

These essential rules of evidence were not observed in the trial of this case, and there is no criterion by which to estimate the influence that this inadmissible matter may have exerted on the minds of the jury.

We are of opinion that the body of the evidence, viewed from the stand point of a demurrer to the evidence, shows that on the night of November 14, 1912, when the engine was turned over to plaintiff's intestate, the boiler and appurtenances were in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which the same were to be put in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life and limb, within the true intent and meaning of the act of Congress. When the explosion occurred, the locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances were in the exclusive custody and control of the engineer and were being operated by him. In these circumstances, upon settled principles, the mere happening of the accident did not per se cast upon the defendant the imputation of negligence; but to warrant a recovery the burden rested upon the plaintiff to prove that the defendant had been guilty of the negligence alleged in the declaration.

Nor is this a case, as was pressed in argument, where the negligence of the engineer should go to mitigate the damages, but not to bar the right of action. The evidence tends to show that the negligence

of plaintiff's intestate was the sole cause, not the contributing cause, of his death, and, therefore the rule invoked under the Employers' Liability Act has no application.

We are further of opinion that the plaintiff has not successfully borne the burden of proof thus resting upon him, and that the evidence was not sufficient to warrant the verdict.

For these reasons the circuit court erred in overruling the motion of the defendant to set aside the verdict on the ground that it was contrary to the law and the evidence.

This view of the case is controlling and renders it unnecessary to discuss the subordinate assignments of error.

The judgment complained of must be reversed, the verdict of the jury set aside, and the case remanded for a new trial.

Reversed.

A Copy.
Teste:

H. STEWART JONES, *C. C.*

VIRGINIA:

Pleas before the Honorable W. W. Moffett, Judge of the Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, in the case of Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, vs. The Virginian Railway Company, removed from the Circuit Court of Montgomery County to the Circuit Court of Roanoke County.

In the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Virginia.

February 4th, 1916.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'x,
v.
VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

This day came the plaintiff, by counsel, and upon her motion leave is given her to file an amendment to her declaration, said amendment consisting of three additional counts, to-wit; Count Number 5, Count Number 6 and Count Number 7.

By consent of parties it is ordered that the defendant may file, during the following vacation of this Court, any demurrers or objections it may be advised to file to said additional counts of said declaration, and said matters may be argued and disposed of during vacation.

I have seen this order.

H. T. HALL.

In the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'x,
v.
VIRGINIAN R'W'Y COMPANY.

Amendment to the Plaintiff's Declaration Consisting of the Addition of Count Number 5, Count Number 6, and Count Number 7.

Fifth Count.

And for this also, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit, on the 24th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 p. m., on said day, the said defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia, to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant Railway Company as a a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer on said engine, No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce. Whereupon, it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of the said locomotive, No. 469, and the appurtenances thereof in proper condition, and safe to operate at said time in the service of pulling the said train as aforesaid, without unnecessary peril to life or limb.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler, and the boiler not in proper condition, said boiler being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in the service to which the same was being put, in this, to-wit, That the stay bolts and crown bolts and bolt heads of said boiler had been previously overheated and burned and broken and were weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the ordinary pressure and strain imposed upon them by the steam which would ordinarily be generated in said boiler in the customary service of the said engine.

And the plaintiff avers that on the said 14th day of November, 1912, at about 10:20 p. m., on said day, at a point in Montgomery County, Virginia, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff's intestate was engaged in the perform-

ance of his said duties as engineer, on said locomotive, No. 469, in pulling said train of cars as aforesaid, the said stay bolts and crown bolts brake, and the crown sheet of the boiler of said engine No. 469 gave way as a result of said improper and unsafe condition of said bolts and bolt heads and the water and steam from the boiler of said engine and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water burst out of and through the stoker holes and into the cab of the engine, and scalded, injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of his engine in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he suffered greatly and died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven, Martha J. Andrews, aged five years, Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews, in this, to-wit, that they have been deprived of his contribution from his salary and earnings as a means of support to them, and the said children have been deprived of his services in their care and education, and they have suffered much and divers other damages in many and divers other ways therefrom.

Sixth Count.

And for this, also, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 p. m. on said day, the defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of Engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars; that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia, to a point or points in West Virginia, and that the said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer on Engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that the said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

Whereupon, it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of said locomotive No. 469, and the appurtenances thereof, in proper condition and safe to operate at

said time in the service of pulling the train as aforesaid, without unnecessary peril to life or limb.

Yet the said defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler, and with a boiler not in proper condition, said boiler being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in the service to which the same was being put, in this, to-wit: that the stay bolts and crown bolts and crown sheet were weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the ordinary pressure and strain imposed upon them by the steam which would ordinarily be generated in said boiler in the customary service of the said engine.

And the plaintiff avers that on said day the said A. W. Andrews left Roanoke, Virginia, at 9:30 p. m., and properly operated the injector on the right side of said engine continuously from the time he left Roanoke until the time of the explosion, as hereinafter set out.

And the plaintiff avers that a few minutes prior to the explosion, as hereinafter set out, the glass water gauge of said engine No. 469 properly registered and indicated that the boiler of said engine was three-fourths full of water.

And the plaintiff avers that about 10:20 p. m., of said day at a point in Montgomery County, about 300 feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, while the said plaintiff's intestate was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on locomotive No. 469, in pulling said train of cars as aforesaid, the bolts of the said boiler of said locomotive broke, and failed and the crown sheet of the boiler of said locomotive gave way, while there was ample water present in the boiler over said crown sheet and bolts, and the water and steam in the boiler of said engine escaped from the boiler and rushed down into the fire box of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water rushed out of and through the stoker holes into the cab of the engine and scalded, injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of his engine, in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he suffered greatly and died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that the giving way of said crown sheet and the explosion and bursting of the boiler of said engine as aforesaid, was caused directly and proximately by the fact that the bolts and crown-sheet were in an unsafe and improper condition, as aforesaid.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and his four cihldren, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven years, Martha J. Andrews, aged five years, Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survive the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews, in this, to-wit: that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood,

support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life, and that her said children have been deprived of his services in their care and education, and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

Seventh Count.

And for this also, to-wit:

That heretofore, to-wit: on the 14th day of November, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was the owner and operator of a certain line of railroad which extended from Norfolk, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, and which ran and extended through the county of Montgomery, Virginia.

That at 10:20 on said day, the said defendant was running and operating a certain freight train consisting of engine No. 469, the tender thereof, three cars loaded with freight, and seventy-nine empty cars, that said empty cars and loaded cars, together with the freight contained in said loaded cars, were being transported from a point or points in Virginia, to a point or points in West Virginia, and that said train was at said time engaged in interstate commerce.

That at said time the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews was in the employment of the defendant railway company as a locomotive engineer, and was engaged in the performance of his duties as such engineer on said engine No. 469, which was pulling said freight train as aforesaid, and that said plaintiff's intestate in his performance of his said duties at said time was engaged in interstate commerce.

Whereupon, it became and was the duty of the said defendant company to have the boiler of said locomotive No. 469, and the appurtenances thereof, in proper condition and safe to operate at said time in the service of pulling the said train as aforesaid, without unnecessary peril to life and limb.

Yet the defendant company, not regarding its said duty, but negligently and wilfully failing in same, did have said locomotive No. 469 at said time equipped with an unsafe boiler and with the appurtenances thereof not in proper condition, said boiler and appurtenances thereof being unsafe and not in proper condition to operate in the service to which they were being put, in this, to wit: that the glass water gauge intended and ordinarily used and relied on by the engineer and fireman as registering and indicating to the engineer and fireman the quantity of water contained in the boiler of said engine at any and all times, was out of repair, and in an unsafe and improper condition, and that said glass water gauge improperly and erroneously registered the quantity of water contained in said boiler.

And the plaintiff avers that on the said day the said A. W. Andrews left Roanoke, Virginia, at 9:30 p. m. and properly operated, used and worked the injector on the right side of said engine continually from the time he left Roanoke until the time of the explosion, as hereinafter set out.

And the plaintiff avers that a few moments prior to the time of the explosion, to-wit: 10:20 p. m., as hereinafter set out, the fireman observed the glass water gauge of said engine No. 469 and said water gauge registered and indicated that the boiler of the said engine was about three fourths full of water.

And the plaintiff avers that about 10:20 p. m. of said day, and before sufficient time had elapsed since the said water glass gauge had indicated the boiler to be three fourths full of water, for said quantity of water to have been consumed or used up in steam to such an extent as to allow the crown sheet to become uncovered or free from water, and while the said train was travelling at a point in Montgomery County, about three hundred feet west of defendant's mile post No. 264, and while the said plaintiff's intestate was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer on locomotive No. 469, in pulling the said train of cars as aforesaid, the crown sheet of the boiler of said locomotive gave way, and the water and steam in the boiler of said engine rushed down into the fire box of said engine, and large volumes of ashes, steam and boiling water rushed out of and through the stoker holes and into the cab of said engine, and scalded and injured and burned the plaintiff's intestate while he was in the cab of the engine, in the performance of his duties as aforesaid, so that he suffered greatly and died therefrom on the following day.

And the plaintiff avers that the giving way of said crown sheet, and the explosion and bursting of the boiler of said engine, as aforesaid, was caused directly and proximately by the fact that the glass water gauge of said engine was in an unsafe and improper condition, as above alleged, and incorrectly and erroneously registered and indicated that said boiler was about three fourths full of water, while the truth was that the water in said boiler was very low, and the absence of a proper quantity of water caused the stay bolts and crown sheet of said boiler to become weakened from heat and give way from the pressure of the steam as aforesaid. And the plaintiff avers that if said water gauge of said engine had properly registered the quantity of water in said boiler said plaintiff's intestate and his fireman could have used the other injector or other means for the purpose of pumping or forcing water from the tank into the said boiler, and could thus have avoided the explosion, and injury and death of the said plaintiff's intestate.

And the plaintiff avers that Maude L. Andrews, the widow of the said A. W. Andrews, and four children, Arthur W. Andrews, aged seven years, Martha J. Andrews, aged five years, Peyton C. Andrews, aged four years, and Macon Andrews, aged one year, survived the said plaintiff's intestate, and this suit is brought for the benefit of said widow and four children.

And the plaintiff avers that the said widow and four children have been greatly damaged by reason of the death of the said A. W. Andrews in this, to-wit: that they have been deprived of his contributions from his salary and earnings as a means of livelihood, support and comfort to them; that the said widow has been deprived of his personal services in and about her daily life and that

the said children have been deprived of his services in their care and education and that they have suffered much and divers other damage in many and divers other ways therefrom.

Wherefore, the plaintiff says she has been damaged in the sum of fifty thousand ($50,000.00) dollars, and hence she brings her suit.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Adm'x of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,
By Counsel, —— ——.

A. B. HUNT,
A. P. STAPLES,
Counsel.

And, at another day, to-wit:

At a Circuit Court Continued and Held in and for the County of Montgomery, May Term, 1916.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'x of A. W. Andrews, Dec'd,

v.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

This day came the parties plaintiff and defendant by counsel, and upon their joint motion, by consent of parties and for good cause shown to the Court, the twenty days' notice for removal being waived by all of said parties, it is ordered that this cause be removed to the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Va.

We consent to the above order.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Adm'x of A. W. Andrews, Dec'd,
By A. P. STAPLES AND
A. B. HUNT,
Her Attorneys.
H. T. HALL,
ELLETT & PHLEGAR.
G. A. WINGFIELD,
Att'ys for the Virginian Ry. Co.

(For Evidence See Printed Copy.)

Demurrer to the Evidence.

VIRGINIA:

In the Circuit Court of Roanoke County.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY

ads.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix.

In Case.

And the said plaintiff, by counsel, produced to the jury, to maintain the issue on her part, the following evidence, namely:

The plaintiff's evidence introduced at the former trial, as set forth from pages 43 to 157 and from pages 518 to 537, in the printed record of this case of The Virginian Railway Company v. Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix, as used on the former appeal in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, a copy of which printed record is herewith filed marked "Exhibit Record," identified by the signature of the Judge of this Court, except such of plaintiff's said testimony as was offered but not admitted in evidence, as contained in the certificate of the Judge of this Court, which is herewith filed marked "Judge's Certificate as to Evidence offered but not admitted."

And the defendant, by its counsel, produced to the jury, to maintain the issue on its part, the following evidence, namely:

The evidence set forth in said printed record, as "defendant's evidence," from page 157 to page 518.

And the said defendant says that the matters aforesaid so introduced and shown in evidence to the jury are not sufficient in law to maintain the said issue on the part of the plaintiff, and that it, the said defendant, is not bound by the law of the land to answer the same; wherefore, for want of sufficient matter in that behalf to the said jury shown in evidence, the said defendant prays judgment, and that the jury aforesaid may be discharged from giving any verdict upon the said issue, and that the said plaintiff may be barred from having or maintaining her aforesaid action against it, and for grounds of its said demurrer to the evidence, the defendant states in writing the following:

(1) That the said evidence does not show that the defendant was guilty of any negligence which was the cause of this accident.

(2) That it appears from the evidence that the said defendant discharged its duty to the plaintiff's intestate by turning over to him a locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate, in the service to which the same was put.

(3) That the evidence shows that the explosion which resulted

in the injury and death of the plaintiff's intestate was caused by low water due to the sole negligence of the plaintiff's intestate.

(4) That the evidence shows that if said explosion was not caused by law water, that it was due to the sole negligence of the plaintiff's intestate in his failure to perform his duty of properly inspecting said boiler.

(5) That if the evidence fails to show that the accident which resulted in the injury and death of the plaintiff's — was not due to the sole negligence of the plaintiffs intestate, as above specified, that it necessarily shows that the injury was the result of an accident which was unforeseen and could not be guarded against and which was ordinarily incident to the employment of the plaintiff's intestate, or of which he knew, or should have known, the risk of danger from which he assumed.

G. A. WINGFIELD,
HALL, WOODS & COXE,
Attorneys for Defendant.

Joinder in Demurrer to Evidence.

In the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'r'x of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

v.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Joinder in Demurrer to Evidence.

And the plaintiff says that the matters aforesaid, to the jurors in form aforesaid, shown in evidence, are sufficient in law to maintain the issue joined on the part of the plaintiff.

Wherefore, forasmuch as the said defendant has given no answer to the same, the said plaintiff demands that the defendant be convicted, that the jury be required to assess her damages and that judgment in her favor against the said defendant be entered thereon.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,
By Counsel, —— ——.

A. B. HUNT,
A. P. STAPLES,
Counsel.

Bills of Exception.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

vs.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill of Exception No. 1.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. RANDOLPH, whose testimony is set forth at large in the demurrer to the evidence in this case, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof; and after the witness had testified he was asked the following questions:

"Q. I wish you would explain to the jury the method of seating those bolts, which have resulted in their being cracked by tight pressure in screwing them up to the crown-sheet?"

To which question the defendant objected but the Court overruled the said objection and allowed the witness to answer the question as follows,—

"A. You see your screwing them here, you have got the pressure of the thread there (indicating) one way, and the underside of this head here, just like any ordinary bolt, and you screw it down like this, and it tightens it and puts the strain on the bolt, and that strain comes between that point there, its maximum is there, between that point and the head. That is always very great, and the practice is a little different, as well as I can get at it, some relying on the fit of the thread there to keep the leakage, others on this pressure right around in here, to fit there. Sometimes, and this looks as if it had been intended, a copper wire or something is put around in that groove to stop the leakage. Now under those circumstances, that puts a heavy strain way out to this edge here, then if there is any distortion, that puts it still greater, and a comparatively light degree of heat may have caused that to break in there. Now, in regard to that, one curious thing that occurs in regard to iron and steel both, and I could best describe it by an experiment which was made, and where I first saw it. A piece of steel, used for boilers, and I have seen the same thing occur with iron, this piece of steel was about that long and about that wide (indicating) and possibly three-eight-s or half an inch thick, it was heated on one end and turned over and folded down flat heated to more than bright red, almost white heat, the other end was cold, turned over and folded down, cold in between, it was heated to a black heat, what we call black heat, and the slightest attempt to bend that cracked it, so that at black heat, both iron and steel are likely to crack. The steady straight-way pull on it does not always show it up, but it is brittle when cold or when quite hot, and would take an amount of movement in there that it would not when black hot, say just under a

dark red. We do not know exactly what that temperature is, I have never found it, but somewhere about that temperature. Now, that would cause that to break off, even when that thread there is usually considered strong enough, if it fits well to hold the load."

Plaintiff then asked the witness the following question:

"Q. You mean, if I understand you, and I don't know whether I got that very clear or not, that when this is screwed up very tight against the crown-sheet, and a bad fit is made of it, if the sheet is heated to a cherry red temperature, the expansion of the crown-sheet causes that to creak off?"

The defendant objected to said question but the Court overruled the said objection and allowed the question to be answered as follows:

"A. Yes, sir; it will cause it to crack right down there, and furthermore, of course, if it bears unevenly on one side or the other the strain is entirely put on one *said* and that makes it crack."

The plaintiff then asked witness the following question:

"Q. And some of those bolts, as I understand you to say, might be completely cracked off and drop down into the fire?"

To which question the defendant objected, but the Court overruled said objection and permitted the question to be answered, as follows:

"A. Yes, sir."

The plaintiff then asked the witness the following question:

"Q. Is that illustrated in the difference between these two bolts, one of which was produced here, not having been in the fire, and this other one here, as to the different method produced that way?"

To which question the defendant by counsel objected, but the Court overruled said objection and permitted the question to be answered as follows:

"A. I do not see very much difference in those, except the one that was not in the boiler has a little blue scale on it yet."

To which ruling of the Court, in permitting the witness to answer the said questions, the defendant by counsel excepted, and tenders this, its Bill of Exceptions No. 1, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record this 20th day of June, 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

vs.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill of Exception No. 2.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. RAN-

DOLPH, whose testimony is set forth at large in the demurrer to the evidence, in this case, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof. And after the witness had testified that the stay bolts looked as if they had been twisted off, the plaintiff by counsel asked the witness the following question:

"Q. Now, if the size of this wrench head which is on the bolt head, is larger than the strength of the thread; in other words, is so large that it will not give way before the threads are stripped, and that is screwed in that way, would it have a tendency to weaken the head of the bolt or injure it or not?"

To which question the defendant objected, but the Court overruled the said objection and allowed the witness to answer the question, as follows:

"A. It would have a tendency to weaken the head of the bolt;"—

To which ruling of the Court, in permitting the witness to answer said question, the defendant by counsel excepted, and tenders this, its Bill of Exceptions No. 2, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 20th day of June, 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge*.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

vs.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill of Exceptions No. 3.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness ARTHUR SCRIVENOR, whose testimony is set forth at large in the demurrer to the evidence, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and who testified as follows, with reference to his qualifications as an expert;

"Direct examination.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. What is your business?

A. An Engineer.

Q. Tell the jury what experience you have had, what line of work you have been engaged in that brings you in touch with locomotive boilers and kindred questions?

A. When I first left school I went to the Barrow Hematite Steam and Iron Works in Lancashire, England, where I was employed in firing boilers and gas producers. From there I went to North Greenwich where they had an experimental station, firing boilers with coal and with oil, they had about seven or eight boilers there, and from there I went to the Unity Iron Works, and from there I came to this country and I was employed at the American Locomotive Works, then the Richmond Locomotive Works, in the draw-

ing offices, and in 1893 I went into business for myself doing engineering work, and for several years I have been occupied in what is called power plant work, familiar with the stationary boilers particularly, and had a good deal to do with boilers and engines, electrical apparatus and things of that kind. In that time I had charge of manufacturing plants, foundry work and machine shops and so forth.

Q. Have you examined the cross-sheet over there in this case?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Hall: I do not think witness has qualified as an expert on locomotive boilers and I would like to ask him a few questions along that line.

By the Court: Very well.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What experience have you had with locomotive boilers, Mr. Scrivenor?

A. You mean in running locomotive boilers?

Q. No, I mean in knowing anything about them.

A. Only while I was in the locomotive works and what I have seen with my eyes at other times since, and what I have read about them.

Q. You were a draftsman in the office of the locomotive works?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers?

A. Except to go to the shops and see how things were carried out and that they were carried out.

Q. To see that they were constructed according to the plans you drew?

A. Yes, sir; I mean going in and getting the details, and I was brought in touch with the work going on in the shops. I do not mean to say we were put in the place of the foreman, because we were not.

Q. You had nothing to do with the construction of boilers, actual boiler work?

A. No, sir.

Q. You had nothing to do with the running of locomotive engines or repairing locomotive engines?

A. No, sir.

Q. And your experience in connection with locomotive engines ended in 1893?

A. Any practical experience that I had with them; yes, sir.

Q. How long were you in the drafting room in the Richmond Locomotive Works?

A. From December, 1891, until they closed in 1893; I have forgotten the month.

By Mr. Hall: That is all I desire to ask the witness, but we think the witness is clearly incompetent to testify as to locomotive boilers.

By Mr. Staples: We think he is qualified to speak as to that.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. I will ask you whether or not in your work in the Locomotive Works at Richmond, you were necessarily brought in contact with the actual manufacture and building of boilers?

A. Yes, sir, I saw them built every day I was there.

By Mr. Hall:

Q. What kind of locomotives were being built in 1893?

A. You mean what types?

Q. Yes.

A. They were older types than are built today.

Q. They were entirely different types of engine?

A. Very much different. The first radial stay fire box, I think, was built at the Richmond Locomotive Works while I was there, and it was designed by the master mechanic of the C. & O. Railroad.

Q. And the types of locomotive engine in their size and kind of crown-sheets and stay-bolts have entirely changed since 1893?

A. I do not think the kind of crown-sheet and the kind of stay-bolts have changed very much since the radial stays and radial crown-sheets were started, but I think the type of locomotive has changed a great deal.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Mr. Scrivenor, did the work that you have done require knowledge of the principles which would be applicable in determining from an inspection of a crown-sheet of an exploded locomotive, a failed crown-sheet, as to the cause of the failure?

Defendant objected.

By the Court: Ask him what experience he has had to enable him to determine that.

Defendant excepted.

A. Ask that question again please.

(The question is read to the witness).

A. You use the word "require," I can not say my work has required that knowledge, but one acquires that knowledge by pursuing that work.

Q. Do you think you are familiar with those principles of mechanical physics which would be involved in determining that?

A. I think so.

By the Court: Go ahead.

Q. Mr. Scrivenor, have you examined the crown-sheet in this case, lying over there in view of the jury?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Court: I suppose it is admitted that is the crown-sheet?

By Mr. Hall: Yes, sir, that is the crown-sheet.

By Mr. Staples: The defendant produced this crown-sheet as the crown-sheet that was blown down when the explosion occurred and when Mr. Andrews was killed.

By Mr. Hall: We object, if your Honor please, to the witness

answering any question with reference to this crown-sheet as an expert witness, on the ground that he has not shown himself qualified to answer as an expert witness.

By the Court: That is to save marking any exceptions hereafter?

By Mr. Hall: Yes, sir.

By the Court: Just note the objection, and objection overruled.

By Mr. Hall: I want to ask one question. Have you ever examined a crown-sheet of a locomotive that failed from low water?

Witness: No, sir.

By Mr. Hall: Did you ever see one in your life before you saw this crown-sheet that had failed and was buckled down as this crown-sheet is?

Witness: I didn't catch that, please read it.

(Question read to witness).

A. Not unless I saw it on a scrap heap. I mean I may have seen one but I can not say definitely at any particular place that I did see one.

Q. You can not say definitely that you ever saw a crown sheet in your life that was blown out on account of low water?

A. I can not say it was blown out on account of low water.

Q. Can you say that you ever saw a crown-sheet blown out in any way in an explosion of an engine?

A. I did not see the explosion, but I have seen damaged engines and damaged fire boxes.

Q. I asked you about locomotive engines.

A. I am speaking of locomotives.

Q. You do not know whether any of them were damaged by an explosion caused by low water or not?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Hunt: Mr. Hall has assumed as a matter of fact this one has, and I submit that it is not proper.

By the Court: Go ahead.

By Mr. Hall: We want to renew our objection to the witness being allowed to testify as an expert as to this crown-sheet.

By the Court: Unless you have some other objection, this one exception can be to all of this evidence along this line.

Defendant excepted.

By Mr. Staples:

Q. Has your experience made you familiar—that is, your experience and study, made you familiar—with the effect upon iron of heat; that is, the effect upon its holding power, and the effect upon its appearance?

A. I have had considerable experience from its appearance.

Q. Have you made any considerable study of the effect of heat upon its holding power?

A. To some extent.

And the defendant, thereupon, by counsel, objected to the said witness being allowed to testify as an expert witness, but the Court overruled said objections, and allowed the witness to testify, which

evidence is fully set forth in demurrer to the evidence, to which reference is hereby specifically made; to which rulings of the Court in permitting the said witness to testify, as an expert witness as set forth in the demurrer to the evidence, the defendant, by counsel, exceped and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 3, which is signed, scealed and made a part of the record this 20th day of June, 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

vs.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill of Exceptions No. 4.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this cause, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, introduced the witness L. S. Randolph, whose testimony is set forth at large in the demurrer to the evidence, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, who was permitted to testify, over the objection of the defendant's counsel, as follows:

"Q. If the water glass was in good, perfect condition at the time it was turned over to the engineer at Roanoke, could it has been possible for scale to have been deposited on it in such a way as to cause it to register erroneous an hour or so later?

A. You will have to define what you mean by scale, the question as stated there seems to indicate that you mean lime salts, which are deposited from the water. I do not see how it would be possible for those lime salts to close up that gauge in an hour or so, if it had been in anywhere near its proper condition when it left Roanoke."

To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to so testify, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tenders this its Bill of Exceptions No. 4, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 20th day of June, 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

v.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill of Exceptions No. 5.

Be it remembered that upon the trial of this case, the defendant, to maintain the issue on its part, introduced the witness A. H. McGhee, whose testimony is set forth at large in the demurrer to the evidence, which is hereby referred to as a part hereof, and after the witness had testified that he had made an inspection of engine No. 469 as required by the Boiler Inspection Law, and had made a

sworn report to the U. S. Government as required by said act, the plaintiff's counsel was permitted, over the objection of the defendant, to cross-examine the witness as follows:

"Q. I will change the form of the question. Did you make a report on engine No. 473 just before its crown-sheet had trouble?

A. When 473 came in there, the night man, he got the engine and then it went to the back shop, and I inspected it there, but I do not know the date.

Q. You still haven't answered my question. I asked you if you made a report of engine 473 just before, not after this trouble, but before it had trouble with its crown-sheet, the same kind of report that you sent in on 469?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You reported that in good fix, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When, as a matter of fact, there was stuff on the crown-sheet, wasn't there?

A. Let me understand you.

Q. After you made this report on engine 473, after you made the report, it developed that there was stuff, filings and scrapings, etc. on the crown-sheet of engine 473, wasn't there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. While its crown-sheet was in that condition, your report was with the Government showing everything O. K., wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir; I think it was, I inspected it."

To which ruling of the Court in permitting the witness to be cross-examined, as above set forth, the defendant, by counsel, excepted, and tendered this its Bill of Exceptions No. 5, which is signed, sealed and made a part of the record, this 20th day of June, 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

Judge's Certificate of Evidence Offered, but Not Admitted.

In the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'r'x,

v.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Judge's Certificate of Evidence Offered, but Not Admitted.

I, W. W. Moffett, Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, do hereby certify that on the second trial of the case of Maude L. Andrews, adm'r'x, v. Virginian Railway Company, the plaintiff, to maintain the issue on her part, offered to introduce the same evidence which she introduced on the first trial of said case, the same being set forth and contained in the printed record of said case which was used in the proceedings whereby a former judgment in

favor of the plaintiff was reviewed on writ of error and reversed by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia; a copy of which said record was filed with defendant's demurrer to the evidence, and marked "Exhibit Record," and that all the said evidence so offered to be introduced at said second trial was introduced and admitted as evidence in the case, except that excluded upon motion of the defendant, which excluded part is as follows:

(1) Witness, JERRE WALTON. From pp. 51, 52 and 53 of said record:

"Q. Tell the jury whether or not that crown-sheet was heated to a red hot heat at the time of this accident?

A. No sir, I cannot say.

Q. Mr. Walton, if a crown-sheet is heated to a red heat will it make any different light in the fire box than when not heated—the difference between a blue and red appearance, I mean?

Defendant objected.

By the Court: You may ask him about the general effect, not at this particular time, but the general effect of overheating.

Defendant excepted.

A. I never did see one heated.

By the Court: You are talking about the under side of that crown-sheet?

By Mr. Staples: Which is the top of the fire box.

Q. How is that fire box made with reference to the crown-sheet, describe that to the jury?

A. I don't know as I could do that.

Q. The best you can; I do not ask you to draw an accurate drawing of it.

A. How the fire box is made?

By Mr. Hunt, continuing:

Q. I will ask you this question: Was the crown sheet of that boiler so much within the range of your vision in firing the boiler that if it had been heated to a red heat that you would have been bound to have noticed it?

Q. Do you understand the question?

A. I couldn't say positively on that.

Q. Give us your best judgment on that?

Q. What do you say to that?

A. I suppose you would.

By Mr. Hall: He answered that question once.

By the Court: He said 'I could not say,' and then a direct question was repeated to him, and he now says he supposes he could.'

By Mr. Hall: Well, we object to it.

Objection overruled. Defendant excepted.

A. You never gave me time to answer that question.

By Mr. Hall: Wait a minute until the court makes a ruling.
By the Court: Go ahead. Do you want to say anything further, Mr. Walton? You started to say something; go ahead and say it if you want to answer it.

A. I started to make an answer a little while ago and then you all objected to it and I never answered the question.

By the Court: When either side objects you just stop talking.
Witness: Yes, sir; I do.
By Mr. Hunt: And after the court rules on it, then you can go on and finish your answer if the court says so.

Q. Now, then, to clarify the record upon this point, do I understand you to say that if the crown-sheet had been heated to a red heat it was so within your range of vision while firing the engine, that you think you would have been bound to have seen it?
A. Yes, sir."

(2) Witness, ARTHUR SCRIVENOR, from page 89 of said record:

"Q. How hot could the sheet have been and retain its present appearance?
A. I couldn't say definitely, as I have no records of my own covering that point.
Q. From your study of the subject?
A. I will state that I have read in 'Treatise on Heat' and such things that I should say a Fahrenheit heat from 1,000 to 1,200 degrees."

From page 105 of said record:

"Q. I wish you would state what effect is sometimes produced upon the bolts of a crown-sheet by the fireman opening the box or opening the door and allowing cold drafts to go in?
A. The expansion of the fire box is due to heat, and if cold air is allowed to strike upon the crown-sheet of any kind of a boiler, it must contract it, if it changes its temperature at all; that subjects the bolt to unequal strain and sudden strain sometimes, and it weakens the bolt in some cases and in some cases it breaks them. In case cold air strikes it, it causes a sudden contraction, an unequal contraction of the sheet, which has been previously heated."

(3) Witness, L. S. RANDOLPH. From page 114 of said Record:

"Q. You do not think that would have affected it?
A. I can not imagine how it would have affected it.
Q. But you think mud or oil might cause it, without the absence of water from the sheet?
A. It might cause it."

From pages 122-123 of said Record:

"Q. I want you to eliminate from your answer the detailing of any experiments which you have made, just give conclusions which you have applicable to this crown-sheet, and if you think you are

qualified to state to the jury the effect of the angle between those sheets upon this crown-sheet in question, the effect upon those bolt heads of the change in the angle between the sheets in this boiler, then you can answer it, otherwise you can not.

Defendant objected. Sustained. Exception.

By the Court: If you can answer that question from your own learning on the subject, you can answer it.

By Mr. Staples: As well as from his experiments?

By the Court: I said from his learning on the particular subject, you can answer it.

A. Include everything?

By the Court: What does learning mean, from your learning on the subject?

Defendant excepts.

A. I think it would have a slight effect on those bolt heads.

Q. State whether or not the change of the relative positions of those two sheets would probably weaken the bolts or bold heads along the top of the whole crown-sheet?

A. It would tend to weaken it; I do not think the motion at the head in the crown-sheet on account of the length of the stays would be sufficient to injure the bolts very seriously unless the engine was running a long time."

From pages 124-125 of said Record.

"Q. Now, as to the button head bolts, is there a liability to injury when they are screwed into the fire box where the holes are not tapped at right angles to the sheet and where the surface of the sheet is curved?

By Mr. Hall: We object to the question, to the substance of the question and not to the form.

A. If your Honor please, I want to change that question a little bit. The tapping—there are two holes to be considered in order to make it clear to the jury, the tapping of one hole at right angles to the sheet, whether that hole is tapped at right angles to the sheet does not matter so very much, but tapping or having both holes punched so that when the stay is put in the heads will come out and bear evenly all around the sheet. Now, if it is not put in so, one side of the head may bear hard and the other side not at all, and then when you screw it up tightly it will tend to crack the head off.

Q. It is, or not, in your opinion, necessary practice in building locomotives to use a seating tool which faces off the inside of the sheet exactly at right angles to the longitudinal axis of the bolts.

By Mr. Hall: We object to the substance of the question.

A. I think it is advisable, though if care is taken in seating those holes I do not think it necessary; or if a washer is used under the head, it would not be necessary."

And I do further certify that the defendant offered to introduce all of the testimony which it introduced on the first trial of this case, as set forth in said printed record from page 157 to 518, and that all of said testimony was admitted in evidence on the second trial.

Given under my hand and seal this 16th day of June, 1916.

[SEAL.] W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

And, at another day, to-wit:

At a Circuit Court Continued and Held in and for the County of Roanoke, at the Courthouse Thereof, on the 16th Day of June, 1916.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Adm'x,

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

This day came the parties by their attorneys, and by consent of parties the demurrer to the fourth count of Plaintiff's declaration was sustained, and the defendant Company, for plea, says it is not guilty in manner and form as against it in said declaration is alleged, and of this it puts itself upon the Country, and the plaintiff doth the like.

And thereupon came a jury, to-wit: C. H. Grove, C. O. Murray, C. B. Strickler, R. N. Betson, W. G. Baer, J. S. Perrow, A. G. Brown who were elected, tried and sworn, the truth to speak upon the issue joined between the plaintiff and the defendant, and having heard the evidence and the instruction of the Court and argument of counsel, and the defendant having interposed its demurrer to the evidence in which the plaintiff joined, the jury retired to their room to consider of their verdict, and after some time returned into Court, and presented the following verdict:

"We, the jury find for the plaintiff and assess her damages at the sum of $20,000.00, and apportion the same as follows:

To Maude L. Andrews (widow)	$4,000.00
To Arthur W. Andrews (child)	4,000.00
To Martha J. Andrews (child)	4,000.00
To Peyton C. Andrews (child)	4,000.00
To Macon C. Andrews (child)	4,000.00

Subject to the opinion of the Court on the defendant's demurrer to the evidence.

C. B. STRICKLER, *Foreman.*"

And thereupon, the Court doth sustain the defendant's demurrer to the evidence, and it is ordered that the plaintiff, Maude L. Andrews Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, take and recover nothing of the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, under

and by her pleadings and action in this behalf, that the verdict of the Jury in favor of the plaintiff, subject to the opinion of this Court on the demurrer to the evidence, be set aside, that the said defendant be hence dismissed, and that said defendant have and recover of and from the said plaintiff, de bonis testatoris, its proper costs expended by it in this trial, to which ruling and judgment the plaintiff excepts.

The plaintiff having indicated her intention to apply to the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia for a writ of error to this judgment, on her motion, it is ordered that this judgment be suspended for sixty days from the rising of this Court.

MEMO.—The Plaintiff and defendant this day each excepted to sundry rulings of the Court.

Opinion of the Court.

Reasons for giving judgment against the plaintiff on the demurrer to the evidence—

Because the evidence is the same as that introduced at the first trial upon which the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, upon which verdict this Court rendered judgment in favor of the plaintiff. The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia reversed the said judgment of this court and in its opinion said that the evidence was insufficient to support the judgment of this Court. Under the well established rule, this thereupon became the law of the case, so far as this Court is concerned and is conclusive and binding.

Judgment is therefore given for the defendant against the plaintiff.

W. W. MOFFETT, *Judge.*

In the Circuit Court for the County of Roanoke, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix — A. W. Andrews, Deceased,

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY, a Corporation.

Petition for Writ of Error and Supersedeas.

Your petitioner, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, conceiving herself aggrieved by the final decision of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, rendering a judgment against her in the above entitled action on June 16, 1916, in favor of the defendant, in that action, Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, adjudging that your petitioner take nothing by virtue of her pleadings and action and adjudging costs to the said defendant against your petitioner, obtained from the Clerk of the said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, a complete

transcript of the Record in said cause, duly certified, and presented the same, together with her petition and assignment of errors, praying for the allowance of a writ of error and supersedeas, by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, to the said judgment of said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, and all of the Judges of the said Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, in vacation, refused to award to your petitioner the said Writ of Error and Supersedeas prayed for on September 29, 1916; and thereafter, towit: on the 13th day of November, 1916, your petitioner again presented her said petition for writ of error together with certified copy of the transcript of the record in said proceedings to the said Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, in open Court while the said Court was sitting in term at Richmond, Virginia, and the said Court on the said 13th day of November, 1916, made a final order refusing to your petitioner a Writ of Error and Supersedeas prayed for by her and declining to take jurisdiction of this cause; a duly certified copy of which order of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia is herewith filed marked Exhibit A and is prayed to be read as a part of this petition.

The said order of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia refusing to take jurisdiction of this case is a final order, and now comes your petitioner, Maude L. Matthews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, plaintiff in error, who was the plaintiff in said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, and prays a Writ of Error from said decision and judgment of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, to the Supreme Court of the United States, the said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, being the highest court of law or equity in said state in which a judgment can be had in said case. And your petitioner prays that said judgment of the said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, entered on June 16, 1916, may be reviewed and reversed, and that judgment may be rendered in favor of your petitioner upon the verdict of the Jury, awarding her damages as shown by the Record in this cause; and your petitioner hereto attaches and files as a part of this petition, her assignment of errors.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS,
Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased.
By W. L. WELBORN,
Her Counsel.

W. L. WELBORN.
A. B. HUNT,
A. P. STAPLES,
Counsel for Petitioner.

Writ of Error is hereby allowed as prayed by the Petitioner, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, Let Writ of Error issue upon the execution of a bond by Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, or someone for her, to the defendant, Virginian Railway Com-

pany, in the sum of One Hundred ($100.00), Dollars the said bond not to operate as a Supersedeas.

Nov. 27 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT,
Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

VIRGINIA:

In the Supreme Court of Appeals, Held at the Library Building, in the City of Richmond on Monday, the 13th Day of November, 1916.

This day came Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, by counsel, and presented her petition in open court for a writ of error and supersedeas to a final judgment of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, entered on the 16th day of June, 1916, against her in favor of the Virginian Railway Company in an action then therein depending wherein the said petitioner was plaintiff and the Virginian Railway Company was defendant, and it appearing to the court that the said petition was presented to the Judges of this Court, in vacation, and the same was maturely considered and the transcript of the record seen and inspected and that on the 29th day of September, 1916, a writ of error was refused by all of the Judges of this Court, and that said action was plainly right, the Court doth refuse said writ of error and decline to take jurisdiction of the case.

A copy,
Teste:

H. STEWART JONES, *C. C.*

Exhibit "A" With Petition for Writ of Error.

In the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix — A. W. ANDREWS, Deceased.

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY, a Corporation.

Assignment of Errors.

Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, Plaintiff in error, comes and files herewith her petition praying for writ of error, and says that there are errors in the record and proceedings of the above entitled cause, lately depending in the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, wherein your petitioner was the sole plaintiff and the Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, was the sole defendant, and makes the following assignment of errors.

I. The Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, erred in sustaining the defendant's demurrer to the evidence, setting aside the verdict of the jury in favor of the plaintiff and entering final judgment in favor of the defendant, and in not overruling said demurrer to the evidence and in not entering judgment in favor of the plaintiff for the amount of damages assessed to her by the said verdict of the jury.

The said plaintiff, as will appear from the transcript of the record and proceedings in this case, asserted the right to recover damages of the defendant under and by virtue of the provisions of two certain acts of Congress the first approved April 22, 1908, known as the Federal Employers' liability Act (35 U. S. Stat. at L. 65, c. 149) and the other approved Feb. 17, 1911, known as the Federal Safe Boiler Act (36 Stat. 913). The said plaintiff, therefore, claimed in this case rights, privileges, and immunities under the Statutes and Laws of the United States, which were denied by the said decision and judgment.

The said errors in the said judgment are more particularly set forth as follows: that is to say, the said Circuit Court erred in sustaining the said demurrer to the evidence and entering judgment for defendant and in not entering judgment for the plaintiff, for the following reasons:

(*a*) The evidence was sufficient to justify the jury in finding that when the locomotive engine No. 469 was delivered to plaintiff's intestate at Roanoke on the night of the injury, the stay bolts and crown sheet of the boiler were not in proper condition and safe to operate in the service of drawing the freight train to which it was attached and that said condition was the proximate cause, or one of the proximate causes, of the death of plaintiff's intestate.

(*b*) The evidence was sufficient to justify the jury in finding that when the locomotive engine No. 469, was delivered to plaintiff's intestate at Roanoke on the night of the injury, the water glass, an appurtenance of the boiler of said locomotive, was not in proper condition and safe to operate in the service of registering the quantity of water in the boiler of said locomotive, while drawing the freight train aforesaid, and that said condition of said water glass was the proximate cause, or one of the proximate causes, of the death of plaintiff's intestate.

(*c*) The evidence as to the circumstances under which the explosion occurred was sufficient to bring the case within the influence of the maxim, res ipsa loquitur, and justified an inference that the death of the plaintiff's intestate resulted wholly or in part from an explosion of the locomotive boiler due to an unsafe water glass, or to unsafe staybolts or unsafe crown bolts or unsafe crown sheet, or a combination of two or more of said causes, and that said unsafe condition of said water glass or stay bolts, or crown sheet, or crown bolts, or of two or more of them, was due to the defendant's violation of the duties imposed upon it under the Federal Safe Boiler Statute (36 Stat. 913) to have the said boiler and appurtenances thereof, of the locomotive No. 469 in proper condition and safe to operate

in the service of pulling the freight train it was then engaged in pulling.

(*d*) The proper construction of the Federal Safe Boiler Statute (36 Stat. 913) renders the defendant liable for an injury resulting from any improper or unsafe condition of the glass water gauge, an appurtenance of the boiler, whether said unsafe or improper condition comes into existence in transit during the run or whether same existed before the commencement of the run, and the evidence justified a finding, on the part of the jury, that the death of plaintiff's intestate was caused either wholly or in part, by unsafe staybolts or crown sheet or unsafe water glass.

For which errors, the plaintiff, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, prays:

1. That the said judgment entered by the said Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, against her on the 16th day of June, 1916, as aforesaid, may be reviewed, reversed and annulled;

2. That a judgment may be rendered in this court in favor of the plaintiff for the damages awarded to her by the verdict of the jury, to-wit: the sum of twenty thousand dollars with interest thereon from the 16th day of June, 1916, and for costs.

3. That all such other and further and more general and complete relief as may be proper in the premises may be granted to her.

And your petitioner will every pray, etc.,

W. L. WELBORN,
A. B. HUNT,
ABRAM P. STAPLES,
Attorneys for the Plaintiff, Maude L. Andrews, Adm'x of A. W. Andrews, Deceased.

Identified as Assignment of Errors with Petition for Writ of Error Received and filed this 27th day of November, 1916.

CHAS. D. DENIT, *Clerk.*

In the Circuit Court for the County of Roanoke, Virginia.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, Administratrix — A. W. Andrews, Deceased,
Plaintiff,

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY, a Corporation, Defendant.

Bond to Cover Costs.

Know All Men by These Presents, that we, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, as principal, and D. W. Peisinger and J. F. Smith, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, in the sum of One Hundred dollars, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals this 28th day of November, 1916.

Whereas, Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix, of A. W. Andrews, deceased, plaintiff in error in a cause lately depending in the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, wherein Maude L. Andrews, was plaintiff and Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, was defendant, seeks to prosecute her writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse the judgment rendered on June 16, 1916, against her in said cause by the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

Now, Therefore, the condition of this obligation is such that if the said Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, plaintiff in error as aforesaid, shall prosecute her said writ of error to effect, and answer all costs which may be attached, if she shall fail to make good her plea, then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS. [SEAL.]
Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, Deceased.
J. F. SMITH, [SEAL.]
D. W. PEISINGER. [SEAL.]

The foregoing bond is hereby approved.

W. W. MOFFETT,
Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Va.

The original of the foregoing bond was lodged with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, on the 1st day of December, 1916, and the following endorsement made thereon: "Bond received and filed, December 1st, 1916.

Teste: CHAS. D. DENIT,
Clerk Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Va."

Citation.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss:*

The President of the United States to Virginian Railway Company, Greeting:

You are hereby cited and admonished to be and appear at and before the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington, D. C., within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to a writ of error filed in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Roanoke County, Virginia, wherein you are defendant in error and Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, is plaintiff in error, to show cause, if any there be, why the judgment rendered against the said plaintiff in error as in said writ of error mentioned, should not be corrected, and why speedy justice should not be done the parties in that behalf.

Witness the presiding and only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, this 29th day of November 1916.

W. W. MOFFETT,
Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

Legal service of the above citation is hereby acknowledged.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
By H. T. HALL, *Counsel.*

November 29th, 1916.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss.*:

The President of the United States of America to the Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, Virginia, Greeting:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment, of a plea which is in the said Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, Virginia, before you, being the highest Court of law or equity of the said State in which a decision could be had in the said suit between Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, Plaintiff in error, and Virginian Railway Company, a Corporation, Defendant in Error, wher-in was drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under, the United States, and the decision was against their validity; or wherein was drawn in question the validity of a statute of, or an authority exercised under, said State, on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws, of the United States, and the decision was in favor of such, their validity; or wherein was drawn in question the construction of a clause of the Constitution, or of a treaty, or statute of, or commission held under, the United States, and the decision was against the title, privilege, or exemption specially set up or claimed under such clause of the said Constitution, treaty, statute, or commission, a manifest error hath happened, to the great damage of the said Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, as by her complaint appears, we being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected, and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, do command you, if judgment be therein given, that then under your seal, distinctly and openly you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same in the said Supreme Court at the City of Washington, District of Columbia, on the 18th day of December, 1916, to be then and there held, that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said Supreme Court may cause further to be done therein, to correct that error, what of right and according to the laws and customs of the United States should be done.

Witness, the Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice of the

said Supreme Court, the 4th day of December, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen.

S. W. MARTIN,
Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia.
By FRANK J. HALL,
Deputy Clerk at Roanoke, Va.

[Seal of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia.]

Allowed by:
W. W. MOFFETT,
Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, Virginia.

The foregoing original writ of error was lodged with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, on the 5th day of December, 1916, and also at the same time and place a copy thereof was lodged in the said Clerk's Office for the Virginian Railway Company, a Corporation, defendant in error.

The following endorsement was made upon said original writ of error and upon each of said copies thereof:

"Writ of Error filed December 5th, 1916.

CHAS. D. DENIT,
Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County Virginia."

Attest:
CHAS. D. DENIT,
Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
County of Roanoke, to-wit:

I, Chas. D. Denit, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true transcript of the record in the case of Maude L. Andrews, — deceased, versus Virginian Railway Company, a corporation, and that the writings annexed to this certificate are true copies of the originals on file and of record in my office, and that said originals, together, constitute the record of proceeding of said Court in this cause.

Witness my hand and the seal of the said Court this 5th day of December, 1916.

[Seal, Circuit Court, Roanoke County, Virginia.]

CHAS. D. DENIT, *Clerk.*

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
County of Roanoke, to-wit:

I, W. W. Moffett, Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of the county of Roanoke, State of Virginia, do hereby certify that

Chas. D. Denit, whose name is signed to the foregoing certificate, is and was at the time of signing the same, Clerk of said Court, duly qualified; that his attestation is in due form of law; that his signature is genuine, and that all his official acts are entitled to full faith and credit.

Given under my hand and seal this 5th day of December, 1916.

[SEAL.] W. W. MOFFETT,
Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia.

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
County of Roanoke, To-wit:

I, Chas. D. Denit, Clerk of the said Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, State of Virginia, do hereby certify that Honorable W. W. Moffett, whose genuine signature is subscribed to the foregoing certificate, is and was at the time of signing and attesting same, Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of the County of Roanoke, State of Virginia, duly commissioned and qualified.

Witness my hand and the seal of said Court this 5th day of December, 1916.

[Seal Circuit Court, Roanoke County Virginia.]

CHAS. D. DENIT, *Clerk.*

Endorsed on cover: File No. 25,646. Virginia Roanoke County Circuit Court. Term No. 816. Maude L. Andrews, Administratrix of A. W. Andrews, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Virginian Railway Company. Filed December 13th, 1916. File No. 25,646.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1918

No. 82

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX
of A. W. ANDREWS, *Deceased*,
Plaintiff in Error

VS.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
Defendant in Error.

REPLY BRIEF OF COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF IN ERROR.

Our original brief, after discussing the construction of the Boiler Act, sets out three grounds of recovery upon which the plaintiff relies: First, that the explosion of the boiler under circumstances where the water glass showed that there was an abundant supply of water in the boiler permits an inference that either the boiler or the water glass, one on the other, was unsafe; Second, that the testimony of *plaintiff's* expert witnesses that the explosion was not caused by low water but by defective bolts and bolt heads, corroborated as it was by the testimony of the fireman that there was ample water in the boiler at the time of the explosion permits an inference that the *boiler* was unsafe; and Third, that the testimony of the fireman that the water glass indicated water in the boiler, taken in connection with the evidence introduced by *defendant* in seeking to prove that the explosion was caused by an absence of water, permits an inference that the *water glass* was unsafe.

If any one of our arguments upon these points cannot be successfully answered, then the plaintiff's right to recover unquestionably follows. If they can be, the reverse is equally true. These three propositions go to the very heart of this case. They cannot be evaded, if the case is to be decided upon its merits. There either is, or there is not, sufficient evidence to sustain them, or one of them. If there is, a reversal of the judgment for the defendant is imperative; if there is not, that judgment must be affirmed.

Under this situation we had the right to expect that, for the sake of clearness of discussion, the opposing brief would join issue with us upon the propositions announced. But a reading of the defendant's brief renders it obvious that if there is anything our adversaries do *not* desire, it is to have to face a clear cut issue involving the real merits of this case. They begin, at the outset, with the vague charge that our statements of what the evidence proves are not borne out by the testimony of the witnesses, when considered as a whole; that in referring to pages of the record we refer to isolated answers which are essentially different from the substance of what the witnesses say. Vague accusations of this kind are easy to make, but contain nothing sufficiently tangible to answer. The statements of the evidence contained in our brief are absolutely accurate, so far as extreme care in their preparation has enabled us to make them so. We do not claim infallibility, however, nor that our vision is not affected by zeal for the interests of our client; but realizing that overstatement or exaggeration is more harmful than otherwise in a court of justice, we endeavored to be guided by this principle, and to state only what we felt convinced the record clearly substantiated. Suffice it to say that adversary counsel, with all their industry, have not discovered a single specific instance in our statement of the evidence which, even from their opposite view point, they regarded as containing error of sufficient importance to bring to the Court's attention.

The greater part of the defendant's argument we anticipated and a sufficient reply thereto is contained in our original brief. Such reply as we propose to make here will be considered under the following divisions or heads:

I. (a) The defendants contention that this case does not involve any question of the proper construction of the Boiler Act; the construction placed upon said act by the Court of Appeals below; and the straw man contained in the opposing argument on the construction of the Statute; and, (b) the construction placed upon said act by this Court in the recent case of *Great Northern Ry. Company v Donaldson*, decided since our original brief was filed.

II. The alleged "findings of fact" by the Appellate Court below and their alleged conclusive effect upon this Court; and the effect here of the difference in opinion between the Trial Court and the Appellate Court below upon the question of the sufficiency of the evidence to sustain the plaintiff's verdict.

III. (a) The defendant's contentions upon the interpretation of the testimony of the plaintiff's witnesses and the weight same is entitled to receive; and (b) the alleged inadmissibility of said testimony.

IV. The defendant's contention that the evidence conclusively establishes low water as the cause of the explosion.

V. The defendant's contention that the testimony of its witnesses that they performed *their* duty of inspecting the boiler and water glass conclusively establishes that the boiler and water glass were in safe and proper condition within the meaning of the Boiler Act.

VI. The admission of the defendant that the testimony of the fireman permits an inference that the water glass was unsafe, and its contention that not-

withstanding same the plaintiff's intestate was guilty of negligence which was *in law* the sole cause of the explosion.

We will now proceed to discuss these subjects in the order designated.

I. (a) THE DEFENDANT'S CONTENTION THAT THIS CASE DOES NOT INVOLVE ANY QUESTION OF THE PROPER CONSTRUCTION OF THE BOILER ACT, THE CONSTRUCTION PLACED UPON SAID ACT BY THE COURT OF APPEALS BELOW, AND THE STRAW MAN IN THE OPPOSING ARGUMENT ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STATUTE.

Adversary counsel contend that the present case does not involve the interpretation of the Federal Boiler Act, but simply has to do with an appreciation of all the facts and admissible inferences for the purpose of determining the sufficiency of the evidence to go to the jury. But the duty owing from the defendant to the plaintiff must necessarily be clearly determined before it can be said whether the evidence justifies a finding that said duty has been violated. Thus, in the case of *Patton v Texas & P. R. Co., 179 U. S. 658*, this court held the rule of *res ipsa loquitur* did not apply to an action to recover for injuries to an employe occasioned by a defective instrumentality, because the circumstances attending the happening of that accident did not permit an inference that the railroad had been wanting in ordinary care in inspecting and repairing same. On the other hand, in the case of *Minneapolis etc., R. Co., v Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66*, which was to recover for injuries to an employee caused by being thrown from the top of a moving train when the cars separated on account of the opening of a coupler, the jury, under an instruction of the court, was permitted to infer a breach of the railroad's duty from the *mere fact that the coupler failed to perform its function*, there being no other proof as to the condition of the coupler. This court, in holding the doctrines of *res ipsa loquitur* applicable to the case, said that the rule announced in the Patton case

was not controlling "*in view of the positive duty imposed by the statute upon the railroad to furnish safe appliances for the coupling of cars.*"

In the case at bar, we earnestly submit, the absolute duty on the part of the railroad to have the boiler and water glass in safe condition, and the abolition of the defenses of contributory negligence and assumption of risk, bring the present case within the ruling of the Gotschall case, and if the evidence as to the circumstances surrounding the explosion is such as to permit the inference that said explosion was actually caused, in part, by an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass then the rule *res ipsa loquitur* is applicable.

The case of *Marcean v Rutland R. Co., 211 N. Y. 203*, is so apposite upon this point that we wish to direct the attention of the Court to it. There it was held that the peculiar facts and circumstances surrounding the explosion of the locomotive boiler permitted the application of the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* in an action by the employee to recover for personal injury. The court said, however, that the engine, being in the custody and control of the plaintiff and his engineer, this rendered it necessary for the plaintiff to supplement the proof of the mere happening of the accident with other circumstantial evidence excluding his own fault as the cause of the explosion. The same principle is applicable in the case at bar.

Our Opponents contend that the Court of Appeals below construed the boiler act in the case at bar upon the same principles that this Court has applied in cases under the other safety appliance acts. But not only does the opinion below *expressly state* that the same principles are *not* applicable, but it also expressly holds that the testimony of defendant's employees that they performed *their* duty of inspecting the boiler and water glass, establishes *as a matter of law*, that the railroad has discharged *its* duties under the boiler act; and furthermore, said opinion below expressly affirms that the defendant's duty is discharged by *turning over to the employee at the beginning of the trip*, an engine with boiler

and appurtenances which have been properly inspected and no defect discovered. Such a construction of the act fails to consider one of the cardinal purposes of these statutes as repeatedly laid down in the decisions of this Court, which has been declared to be to transfer from the employee the burden of losses due to such accidents from defective appliances and place it upon the carrier as a part of the industrial risk.

As a matter of fact, the decision of this case turns wholly upon the construction of the statute. There is little or no conflict in any of the testimony except that of the expert witnesses; and the testimony of the fireman Jerry Walton necessitates the conclusion that either the water glass was unsafe or else the boiler was unsafe. The only question is whether the Court of Appeals was correct when it held that the railroad "discharged its statutory duty to the engineer *by turning over to him*" an engine the boiler and appurtenances of which the company's employees testified they had inspected without discovering any defect, or whether as held by this court in the Gotschall case, the jury should be "permitted to infer negligence on the part of the company from the fact that the" boiler or water glass, one or the other, "*failed to perform its function*". In addition to this, the plaintiff's case is strengthened by the testimony of her expert witnesses that the stay bolt heads showed they had been previously broken and that the appearance of the crown sheet indicated that there was water in the boiler when the explosion occurred.

Opposing counsel have been extremely agile in evading any argument upon the question whether evidence of the explosion of the boiler under circumstances where the water glass indicated water in the boiler would permit recovery under the principles applied in the Gotschall case. The only argument contained in their entire brief upon the construction of the Boiler Act is a *pretended* one on pages 8-10 inclusive. Let us refer to it and see if it meets fairly in the face the question here presented.

Their argument takes the form of answering a contention we are said to have made in our original brief. We quote from page 8 of their brief, where they say:

> "The plaintiff's contention is that under a proper construction of the boiler act, *the mere fact of an explosion* is sufficient for the inference to result that there was a defect in violation of the act."

And the entire argument on the construction of the act is devoted to answering this supposed contention of ours.

But what justification or excuse is there for imputing the above contention to us? Undoubtedly we have not made any such argument in our brief filed in this Court, as we now take the pains to demonstrate by quoting from it at page 47 where we said:

> "However the locomotive, being in charge of the engineer and requiring attention from him to prevent an explosion, even when in proper condition, *evidence of the mere fact of an explosion while in charge of the engineer would seem not to be sufficient to prove a violation of the duty imposed by the statute for his protection*, but the evidence must show that the explosion occurred under such circumstances as that it would not have occurred if the boiler and appurtenances had been safe."

And on page 40 of our brief we said:

> "But the fact that the boiler requires attention by the engineer to prevent its exploding is a good and sufficient reason why evidence of the mere fact that it did explode while in his charge should not be sufficient, in and of itself, to prove that the statute has been violated, for, *in the absence of evidence as to the circumstances attending the explosion*, it may perhaps

be as probable that the accident occurred through his lack of attention as that it occurred from an unsafe appliance."

Thus, not only once, but *twice*, in our brief, we expressly, clearly and unequivocally stated that our views are directly the opposite of those opposing counsel impute to us. It is equally as clear from an inspection of the pleadings and the conduct of the trial that we made no such contention in the courts below.

What a complete confession of weakness is this attempt to becloud the issue, this "answer to the wrong point." Instead of replying to our argument that recovery may be sustained by evidence of the explosion of the boiler *under circumstances where the water glass indicated ample water over the crown sheet*, they boldly set up this straw man and vigorously proceed to demolish it. In lieu of combating our proposition that the Boiler Act fixes liability upon the Railroad for the death of this man if it resulted in part from a defective boiler or water glass, even though the defect was not discoverable by inspection, or came into existence in transit, they *invent* something to argue about, which no one has ever disputed and which no lawyer ever would dispute.

In reality, the principles laid down in the decisions of this Court, cited in our original brief, are so clearly and firmly expressed in said decisions that our opponents have been compelled to concede to our contentions as to the construction of the Boiler Act. The admission, however, is sought to be concealed in the attack upon the straw man above shown, and is couched in such language as to give the impression that those views have been entertained by them all along, and that we are combating them. Suffice it to say, however, that they admit that in cases under the act a breach of the duty thereby imposed may "be inferred from the happening of an accident," where there is "shown by the evidence such a condition of affairs that the accident, according to the ordinary experience of mankind,

might have been caused by the failure of the defendant to perform some legal duty." (Pages 9-10).

Who will dispute the proposition that if a boiler exploded at a time when the water glass indicated that it was nearly full of water, the explosion "might have been caused" by an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass?

This brings us to the consideration of a recent decision of this Court construing this very act.

(b) THE CONSTRUCTION PLACED UPON THE BOILER ACT BY THIS COURT IN THE RECENT CASE OF GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY *v* DONALDSON, 246, U. S. 121.

The opinion in the above case was published in the advance sheets of the Supreme Court Reporter after our original brief had been filed. We have before us the record and briefs of counsel, and the various contentions advanced by the respective parties and the testimony introduced in support of them bear such striking resemblance to the case at bar that we feel that it will be of assistance to the Court in disposing of the present case, to refresh their memory upon the issues and questions there involved.

The action was to recover for the death of a locomotive engineer who was killed by the explosion of the boiler upon the locomotive he was at the time in charge of operating. The plaintiff sought to recover upon three theories set out in her complaint: (1) That the stay bolt heads were too large for an oil burning engine and became hot and gave way when there was ample water in the boiler; (2) That the railroad had allowed scale to accumulate inside the boiler which had caused the crown sheet and bolt heads to become hot and give way when there was water in the boiler; and (3) That if the explosion was caused by absence of water from the sheet, the defendant was liable because of its failure to have a fusible plug installed in the crown sheet, which, it was claimed, would melt in the event of low water, and notify the engineer of the danger. The plaintiff

claimed that the boiler was unsafe in these three respects and that said unsafeness was a violation of the Boiler Act.

The instructions of the trial court told the jury that if the boiler was unsafe in any of the respects mentioned in the complaint it constituted a violation of the duties prescribed by the Boiler Act. The Supreme Court of the State of Washington having affirmed the judgment for the plaintiff, the case was brought to this Court by writ of error. The contention of the railroad made here upon the construction of the statute was that if the unsafeness of the boiler was due to the type or design of construction, that is—to the use of the large bolt heads or want of use of a fusible plug in the crown sheet—this did not amount to a violation of the act, as the provisions of the Act only made it mandatory upon the railroad to have and maintain the type of boiler it had adopted in safe and proper condition; that the question of what type or design of construction was to be used was for the Federal Boiler inspectors to prescribe, and as they had not disapproved of the large button head bolts or of the failure to use a fusible plug in the crown sheet, the use of the one or non-use of the other could not amount to a violation of the act. Counsel for the railroad, in their arguments to sustain their view of this statute, frequently quoted from the opinion of the Court of Appeals of Virginia in the present case, showing that the Virginia Court had taken the same view they contended for. But this Court declined to accede to their arguments, holding on ths contrary, that in view of the requirements of Section two of the Boiler Act, the fact that the boiler was unsafe amounted to a violation of the statute.

Points of striking similarity in the evidence adduced by the railroad companies in the Donaldson case and in the case at bar respectively, will be hereafter noticed in discussing the subjects heretofore outlined under the Fourth Head.

We will now take up the question most emphasized in the opposing brief.

II. The Alleged "Findings of Fact" by the Appellate Court Below and Their Alleged Conclusive Effect Upon This Court, and the Effect Here of the Difference in Opinion Between the Trial Court and the State Appellate Court Upon the Question of the Sufficiency of the Evidence.

The brief of defendant in error in reality is devoted, not so much to the merits or demerits of this case, as it is devoted to an effort to impress the seal of finality upon the opinion of the Court of Appeals of Virginia reversing plaintiff's judgment on the first trial, and, by constant and repeated references to and restatements of said opinion, to draw attention from the real question here involved. Expressions contained in said opinion, our opponents time and again refer to as "findings of fact", behind which, they contend, this court cannot go. Indeed, the whole case has been approached by them, not from the standpoint of whether there was enough evidence to carry the question of recovery to the jury, *but from the standpoint of whether the Railway Company produced enough evidence to sustain these alleged "findings of fact,"* which are claimed to be found in the opinion rendered *on a former trial* by the Virginia Appellate Court.

The error of this position of our opponents—that the Virginia Court of Appeals has "found the facts" and that unless there is a palpable failure of evidence to support said "findings of fact" there can be no reversal—clearly appears from a number of recent decisions of this court. In the first place no "*questions of fact*" were before the Virginia Appellate Court. On the contrary every issue of fact had been resolved in favor of plaintiff in error by the verdict of the jury. The entire decision in the State Appellate Court depended upon the *legal question* whether, conceding the utmost probative value to the plaintiff's evidence, there was enough to sustain the jury's verdict. This *question of law* the trial court had decided in favor of the plaintiff by refusing to set aside the verdict, though under the prac-

tice in Virginia the trial court is allowed much greater latitude in disturbing the verdict of a jury than the Court of Appeals.

As we have said, repeated decisions of this Court demonstrate the error of this contention of the Railway Company, but we need refer to only two of them.

The recent case of *Union Pacific Railroad Company v Huxoll, 245 U. S. 535*, involved liability under the Federal Employers Liability Act and Safety Appliance Act relating to power brakes, for the death of a locomotive engineer. The Supreme Court of Nebraska having affirmed a judgment in favor of the plaintiff the case was brought here by writ of error. The following excerpt from the opinion applies to the point here under discussion:

> "The oral argument of counsel for the plaintiff in error was practically confined to the proposition that the trial court committed reversible error in submitting these questions to the jury, for the reason that even if it be assumed, (as it must be, for there is sharp conflict on the point), that the power brake was not in working order, there was no substantial evidence in the case that this failure contributed, in whole or in part, to cause the death of Huxoll. * * * *It is necessary for us to examine the evidence in the record* to determine the validity of this claim, for the reason that *it presents a federal question, not of fact, but of law.* (Creswell v Knights of Pythias, 225 U. S. 246; Seaboard Air Line v Padgett, 236 U. S. 668)".

An earlier case, that of *North Carolina R. Co., v Zachary, 232 U. S. 248*, which was an action for the death of a locomotive engineer, is even more closely akin to the case at bar. The right of recovery there was materially affected by the question whether the decedent, at the time he was killed, was engaged in in-

terstate commerce. The railroad requested instructions submitting this question to the jury, but they were refused by the trial court, and their refusal approved by the Supreme Court of the State *upon the ground that the evidence showed the fact to be that the decedent was not engaged in interstate commerce.* After referring to the questions raised, the opinion of this Court goes on to say:

> "*It was, however, held by the Supreme Court of North Carolina that deceased, at the time he was killed, was not in fact employed by the Southern Railway, the lessee, in interstate commerce.* There are several grounds upon which this decision was based, or upon which it is said to be supportable, and these will be separately noticed. Of course, *if upon the evidence any essential matter of fact was in doubt, it should have been submitted to the jury* under proper instructions. The rulings of the trial court deprived plaintiff in error of the opportunity to go to the jury upon the question. But it is now insisted that there was *no evidence* tending to show that deceased was engaged in interstate commerce. *This renders it incumbent upon us to analyze the evidence* to the extent necessary to give to plaintiff in error the benefit of its asserted federal right. Southern Pac. Co., v Schuyler 227 U. S. 601, and cases cited."

After proceeding to discuss the evidence, the opinion continues:

> "We conclude with respect to the facts necessary to bring the case within the federal act, that *there was evidence that at least was sufficient to go to the jury.* It is doubtful whether there was substantial contradiction respecting any of these facts; *but this we need not consider.*"

Thus in the above case, what opposing counsel would term the "findings of fact" by both State Courts, was reviewed by this Court, the evidence was analyzed and the case reversed upon the ground that "there was evidence that at least was sufficient to go to the jury."

Therefore, plainly the question now before this court is *not*, as our opponents contend, whether the record discloses sufficient evidence to support the alleged "findings of fact" by the Court of Appeals, but the question here is the legal one whether there was any evidence tending to support the federal right asserted by the *plaintiff* and the verdict of the jury in her favor.

A further effort to avoid a too careful scrutiny of the evidence by this Court is found in the Railway Company's contention that it comes here with the favorable action of the trial court, concurred in by the Court of Appeals. Under the practice followed in *Myers v Pittsburg Coal Company, 233 U. S. 184*, where the judgment of the trial court entered upon the jury's verdict for the plaintiff was reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals for absence of testimony to sustain it, this court examined the evidence, unprejudiced by the judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals; and if there was a division of opinion between the courts below in the case at bar, the same practice applies here by virtue of Section 237 of the Judicial Code, which provides that the writ of error from this Court to a *State* Court "shall have the same effect as if the judgment or decree complained of had been rendered or passed in a Court of the United States."

The railroad's contention that this case is to be considered here upon the assumption that it has secured the favorable action of the trial court, concurred in by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, is obviously wrong. On the first trial the jury found in favor of the plaintiff, and the learned Circuit Judge overruled defendant's motion to set aside the verdict as contrary to the law and the evidence, but entered judgment thereon. The evidence, *as contained in the record before this court,*

was certified to the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia and reviewed under section 3484 of the Va. Code, which provides that:

> *"When a case at law, civil or criminal is tried by a jury, and a party excepts to the judgment or action of the Court in granting or refusing to grant a new trial on a motion to set aside the verdict of a jury on the ground that it is contrary to the evidence, and the evidence, (not the facts), is certified, the rule of decision in the Appellate Court in considering the evidence in the case shall be as on a demurrer to the evidence by the appellant."*

The Court of Appeals said that it was of opinion that the evidence, "viewed from the standpoint of a demurrer to the evidence" was insufficient to support the judgment of the Circuit Court and the verdict of jury, and therefore reversed said judgment, set aside said verdict and remanded the case for a new trial.

Of course this was not a final judgment to which a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States would lie, and in order to have this court review this *question of law*, (sufficiency of the evidence), it was necessary to go through the form of a new trial at which the same evidence was introduced and a demurrer thereto interposed by the railroad. The decision of the Court of Appeals upon the question of law raised by this demurrer having become the law of the case, the hands of the Circuit Court were tied. It could not exercise any independent judgment in the matter but must, per-force, follow the mandate of the Court of Appeals, which it did, sustaining defendant's demurrer. But this judgment was not yet that of the highest court of the state in which a judgment could be had, such as might be brought up under Section 237 of the Judicial Code. (*Cox v. Armour, 237 U. S. 413*). Therefore the plaintiff had to go through the form of having the Court of Appeals, in term time, refuse a writ of error to again review the very question it had already

OOR COPY

decided, and which was as conclusively *res judicata* there as it had been in the Circuit Court. Of course this writ of error was refused as a matter of form.

By virtue of these proceedings, *formal only*, though necessary to bring the case here, the railroad claims to have the *favorable concurrent opinion* of the state courts, trial and appellate, upon the legal question of whether there is any evidence of plaintiff's federal right here asserted. To sustain this contention would be to follow the shadow and ignore the substance of what has been done, or to borrow an expression of Judge Taft in *Taylor v. Louisville and Nashville Railroad Co., 31 C. C. A. 537*, "It is to stick in the bark and to be blind to the substance of things. It is to sacrifice justice to its incident."

It is also said by our opponents that certain evidence was excluded on the second trial which was admitted on the first, and this rendered the question presented on the demurrer to the evidence at the second trial essentially different from that on the first and therefore that it will be presumed that in sustaining this demurrer the trial court was not merely following the mandate of the Court of Appeals but was exercising its independent judgment. Did the trial court, however, regard the evidence which it rejected, (which obviously has no bearing upon the real questions in the case), as presenting a different question? On the contrary, *the trial court's opinion says: "Because the evidence is the same* * * * * * this thereupon became the law of the case, so far as this Court is concerned, and is conclusive and binding."

Opposing counsel contend that the opinion of the Court of Appeals on the first trial contains "findings of fact," and that these "findings of fact" conclude the case, yet they also contend that the Circuit Court exercised independent judgment in sustaining the demurrer to the evidence on the *second trial*, after these alleged "findings of fact" had been made. It is difficult to reconcile these two positions, both of which are untenable; the first, because the Court of

Appeals decided only the *legal* question of whether there was *any* evidence of the federal right asserted; and the second, because this legal question so decided was the same legal question which the demurrer to the evidence raised for the Circuit Court on the second trial, and, the evidence being the same, said question had become *res judicata*.

Because opposing counsel, however, have laid such great stress upon the opinion of the State Appellate Court and have so persistently invoked it as a reason why this court should not make more than a mere perfunctory examination of the evidence, we feel it our duty to endeavor to offset that contention by emphasizing a number of important mistakes which occur in the recitals of the evidence as contained in the opinion of the Court of Appeals in this case. This we do with the utmost respect for the Appellate Court below, for which we entertain sentiments of the highest regard and deference, and it would be a source of deep regret to us if we thought that anything in this brief could be construed in any sense as a criticism or reflection, either upon the ability of that Court, or the care and consideration which this case has received at its hands. We are convinced that the reason the Court did not, in its recitals of the testimony, adhere to the rules applicable for considering testimony upon a demurrer to the evidence, is because, under its construction of the Boiler Act, it did not consider that the ultimate question of the right of recovery was affected, one way or another, by the circumstantial evidence, even conceding these circumstances to be as plaintiff claimed. Not finding what it considered sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a specific defect in the boiler or appurtenances *when the engine was delivered at the beginning of the trip*, this ended the case with the court below, as we view its opinion; and its recitals of the evidence, which the Court will observe, are recitals of the *defendant's* evidence almost exclusively, are wholly *obiter dicta* under the Court of Appeal's construction of the Boiler Act.

This is our view of the opinion below. If we are wrong, and if the writer of that opinion did intend it as an analysis of the entire testimony of both sides, subjecting same to the stringent rules adverse to the Railway Company which a demurrer to the evidence compels, we can only say that 'tis human to err, and we are convinced that error has been committed, otherwise we would not have brought the case here.

As stated, opposing counsel are endeavoring to use said opinion against us in their effort to induce this Court to shut its eyes to the real evidence before it. In other words the very identical erroneous conclusions of the Court of Appeals which this writ of error is designed to have reviewed here are made the basis of nearly the entire argument in support of the defendant's effort to have said erroneous conclusion affirmed.

We therefore respectfully submit that the recitals of the evidence contained in the opinion of the Court of Appeals below are obviously not intended to be accurate, but are in fact erroneous, and are not supported by the record, in the following particulars:

1. The opinion says, "On Nov. 11, 1912, three days prior to the accident, it, (the boiler) was inspected by *government inspectors under the act of Congress.*"

But the record shows that the inspection referred to was not conducted by a *government* inspector but was claimed to have been made by defendant's employee, Funk, who said he had not even served his boilermaker apprenticeship and did not claim to be an expert.

2. The opinion says, with respect to the testimony of the fireman, Walton: "This witness admittedly had no familiarity with that type of engine, *that being his first trip on an engine of that class;* and not to mention distractions incident to the discharge of his duties as fireman, *his only opportunity for acquiring information concerning the engine, boiler and appurtenances covered an hour in time and eighteen miles in distance.*"

But the record shows that the witness had been fireman eighteen months and that as to his previous experience *on this class of engine* his testimony was as follows:

Q. Had you fired for other engineers *on the same class and kind of engine that this was?*

A. Yes sir.

Q. Will you tell the Court and jury how many injectors they worked on their runs?

A. Just one is all I ever knowed *on that class of engine.*

(See Record Page 54)

3. The opinion says: "Walton also testified that the injector was working properly and supplying water to the boiler, basing his opinion on the sound it gave forth; *yet he admitted he was without experience as to injectors of that sort.*" But the italicized portion of the above quotation is not only not borne out by the witness's testimony but on the contrary he said he did know how to operate the injector, but had forgotten, and he steadfastly and repeatedly maintained that he could *easily* tell by the sound whether the injector in question was working properly, and his description of the characteristic sounds of said injector, when working properly and when not so working, was corroborated by the testimony of a number of other witnesses as shown in our former brief, pages 53-55 inclusive.

4. After referring to the alleged inspection of the crown sheet on November 11, 1912, and the subsequent alleged inspections of the two hostlers and plaintiff's decedent, which consisted of their merely standing in the cab and looking through the firebox door at the crown sheet, the opinion goes on the say: "It thus appears from the undisputed evidence that at 9:30 P. M.

the time of departure for Princeton, just one hour before the explosion, the defendant had complied with every requirement of the boiler act, and the locomotive engine, boiler and appurtenances measured up to statutory standard."

Thus, merely from evidence of these perfunctory inspections, which the evidence shows would not have revealed the defective condition of the stay bolts, the Court of Appeals has drawn the conclusion, *as a matter of law*, that the crown sheet, stay bolts and water glass were actually in proper condition and safe to operate within the meaning of the boiler act. This is clearly erroneous as we have shown from a consideration of the evidence and from the decisions of this court, in our former brief, pages 56-64 inclusive, and as appears from the decision in Great Northern Ry. Co. v Donaldson, supra.

5. After referring to the testimony given by plaintiff's expert witnesses to the effect that an examination of the crown sheet and stay bolts of the exploded locomotive led them to the opinion that the crown sheet had been overheated on some occasion prior to the explosion, the opinion says: "*But these theories were refuted by the positive evidence that the crown sheet had not previously been burned, and that there was no oil or other foreign substance in the boiler at the time of failure.*" This is also clearly a mistake, because the only inspections claimed to have been made of the crown sheet after the inspection on November 11, 1912, consisted of standing in the engine cab and looking through the firebox door at the crown sheet, *while there was a fire in the firebox.* It is quite obvious, as two of defendant's witnesses admitted, that it could not be determined by an inspection of this kind whether the crown sheet had been previously overheated or not. (For references to this testimony see our former brief, Pages 59-61 inclusive). Not a single witness claimed that such an inspection would disclose whether the crown sheet had been previously burned and certainly neither by the inspection of Nov. 11, 1912, nor by those of looking in the firebox door could it possibly

have been ascertained *whether there was scale or oil on the inside of the boiler.* There was absolutely no evidence that the inside of the boiler was free from scale or oil; on the contrary the evidence indicated that the water used in defendant's boilers was very bad and had a strong tendency to form large quantities of mud scale. (Record Pages 359-360.)

The opposing brief lays stress upon the statement of plaintiff's expert witness Randolph that the bagging in the crown sheet between the bolt holes was such as would be revealed by "*inspection.*" With this statement we agree. But neither Randolph nor any other witness said or intimated that this bagging could be discovered by looking through the firebox door when the engine was under fire. This was not the method of inspection Randolph referred to. The inspection which Funk says he made on November 11, 1912, several days before the explosion, to perform which he says he removed all fire from the engine and entered the firebox might, if properly conducted, have revealed the bagged condition, if it then existed, though the record shows that the company's inspector of boilers had previously reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission that the crown sheet of another engine, No. 473, was in good condition, whereas, a day or so later, the crown sheet of said engine was burned, standing in the yards at Princeton, on account of accumulated material inside the boiler which said inspector had failed to discover or report. (Record Pages 218-219).

6. The opinion further says: "As remarked, the engine left Roanoke an hour before the accident in good condition, and there was no evidence of leakage during the short run of 18 miles, *which would necessarily have been the case had the theory of the experts that the crown sheet had been previously burned been correct.*".

This statement is in the very teeth of the undisputed testimony of defendant's own expert witnesses who admitted that a comparatively large number of

engines are at all times in service on nearly every railroad, the crown sheets of which have been previously burned and the engines are not leaking. (See Record, pages 144, 145, 421, 422, 457, 497).

7. The opinion also says that "it was *in evidence*" that if the injector was not working properly, "*the interval of time which elapsed between Singer's Tank and the point of accident was sufficient for the crown sheet to become exposed from lack of water*".

If the Court intended this as an interpretation of the evidence bearing on this issue of fact, it is absolutely wrong and concerns a most vital fact in the case. We have shown in our former brief that the quantity of water in the boiler at Singer not only *could not have been consumed* at the time of the accident but that defendants superintendent of Motive Power, one of its chief witnesses *admitted* that it could not. (See our former brief, Pages 48-52 inclusive).

The opinion entirely ignores all the evidence of the plaintiff on this question, as well as admissions of the defendant's witnesses, and defendant's brief does not even attempt to answer our argument on this point. There was no evidence in the record to the effect that the crown sheet could have become exposed from lack of water in the time indicated.

8. The opinion, referring to plaintiff's expert testimony says, "*the opinions of the witnesses were neither founded upon facts within their own knowledge or established by other evidence in the case*".

It is a fact, and the record so shows, that the crown sheet and twelve of the bolt heads from the exploded locomotive *were in court*, were examined by plaintiff's witnesses, the trial court and the jury, and that *the testimony of plaintiff's experts was based upon their personal inspection and examination of said sheet and bolts*, and rested upon the same foundation as the testimony of defendant's expert witnesses.

9. The opinion mentions the fact that the engine was *operated* by Andrews exclusively after the inspection of Nov. 11, but *fails to consider* the further fact that fully *half the time* thereafter, until the explosion, said engine was in charge of defendant's roundhouse employees, and that the crown sheet would perhaps more probably have been overheated while in their charge than while in charge of Andrews, because the engineer has the very strongest motives to watch the engine, his very life being dependent upon his care in so doing, whereas, in the roundhouse, no one remains on the engine, and the evidence is that water has to be replenished numerous times a day in the boilers of engines in the yards or roundhouse. It will be recalled that defendant's hostler, Neece, in explaining why he went outside of his duties in inspecting the crown sheets of engines with a torch, said: "We had had so much trouble with fellows claiming we had burned engines around there, that was the reason I done that". (Record, Page 320).

We wish to call the Court's attention to the fact that the above erroneous recitals of evidence are pointed out in our original Brief, and opposing Counsel could have replied upon the point if they had thought proper. As stated above, we have given here a summary of them for the purpose of demonstrating that the Court of Appeals could not have intended these recitals as an analysis of the evidence under a demurrer or that if it did so intend them, they are clearly, unquestionably and obviously erroneous.

We pass to the next point.

III. (a) DEFENDANT'S CONTENTIONS UPON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES AND THE WEIGHT SAME IS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE.

The opposing brief contains frequent insinuations and some open attacks upon the credibility and good faith of the plaintiff's witnesses. Our adversaries are

perfectly well aware that the purpose and effect of their demurrer to the evidence was to concede all such questions and remove them from the case, and that matter and argument of this kind is utterly foreign here.

We might safely pass it by as an obviously unworthy effort to implant in the minds of the Court a suspicion that the plaintiff's case is predicated upon false testimony and should be viewed with disfavor. As said, we might safely pass by this feature, but we choose not to do so. The character and trustworthiness of the plaintiff's witnesses are not such as require to be shielded behind any rule of law. This question has been injected into the case, and we propose briefly to answer it.

Professor Randolph is the chief target singled out. Unable to refute his opinion, they attack his good faith. Ripe in years and rich in experience, this is a man to whom the educational authorities of Virginia have thought fit to entrust the education, guidance and training of the young men of that State for a period of over 20 years. Graduating from one of the foremost technical schools in America, the Stevens Institute of Technology, where he became thoroughly grounded in the rudimentary principles of his profession, he proceeded to devote a number of the years of his young manhood to acquiring that practical experience so necessary to a full rounded development. The knowledge of principles thus acquired thereafter became fixed, broadened and enriched in the work of teaching them to others.

Thus he was when he came to testify.

Coming now to the attacks upon his testimony. Professor Randolph testified that the appearance of the crown sheet could not have been as it was at the trial if the explosion had been caused by low water. This testimony, of course goes to the very heart of the case, and is highly important. Now mark the effort to belittle its value. Referring to this testimony, the

opposing brief at Page 21 says: "When asked as to *when* this burning of the crown sheet occurred, he stated that it might have been three or four days, *or it might have been as many seconds before the failure*, that he could not tell", and the Court is cited to Pages 148 and 149 of the Record in support of the above statement. Of course such a statement, if it had been made, would have the effect of rendering the whole testimony of the witness absurd on its face. But a reading of his testimony not only shows that he nowhere made the statement above attributed to him, but that he said nothing even *similar thereto*. What he did say was that the sheet could not have presented the appearance it did unless sufficient time had elapsed since the overheating for the water to get back on the sheet and cool it, and that this would, at the least, require *from a half to three quarters of an hour*. Opposing counsel then proceed to argue from this, that the crown sheet may have become overheated between the time of leaving Roanoke and arriving at Singer Tank but the testimony of the fireman, Walton, that he watched the water glass at short intervals and that it showed a gradual rise of the water level in the boiler all the time after leaving Roanoke, conclusively negatives any such possibility.

We wish to refer the Court to Page 141 of the Record where this witness, after expressing the opinion that some of the bolts failed first and the balance ripped out afterwards, was asked the question "how long was it between the time the first part failed and the whole thing went down"; to this he replied, "It might have been three or four days; it may have been as many seconds; I cannot tell". The effect of this statement is merely, that so far as the evidence before the witness showed, some of the bolts may have broken three or four days before the explosion, or the whole thing may have occurred in three or four seconds. This, however had nothing to do with when the overheating of the crown sheet occurred. He nowhere stated that the

overheating of the crown sheet may have occurred three or four seconds before the explosion.

We will next notice the statement on page 33 of the Railway Company's brief where it is said that Randolph admits that he did not have before him sufficient evidence to check his opinion referring to page 114 of the Record. This is a manifestly incorrect version of what the witness said. Reading his answer as a whole, his statement was that there was not enough of the remnants of the explosion before him, so that he could say, "whether it, (the crown sheet), was more down on one side of the firebox than the other, and therefore, just the location of these bags; it is difficult to say whether they were due to *mud or oil*, or sometime previously, low water". But defendant claims that the evidence shows that the condition referred to was not due to previous low water. It follows, therefore, that if their contentions in this respect were sound, said condition was due to mud or oil. It will be recalled that defendant lost all the broken bolts (except two which were so rusty nothing could be inferred from them,) and 95 per cent of the broken bolt heads. Under these circumstances, its willingness to endeavor to detract from the weight of plaintiff's evidence because of its own failure to produce this additional evidence, cannot be said to come with good grace. There was ample evidence before this witness, however, for him to state positively that the explosion was not caused by low water, and that one-fourth of the particular bolt heads *selected by the defendant* as evidence had been previously broken.

Again at Page 28 of the opposing brief Randolph's statement—that the way certain of the bolt heads were broken down into the heads, and the color of the break, indicated that the break occurred while the metal was hot—is claimed to be inconsistent with his statement that the crown sheet had water on it when it failed. But so far from being inconsistent with his other testimony, the above statement is in complete harmony with the opinion expressed by him that

the crown sheet and bolt heads had been *previously* overheated from low water, scale, mud or oil, *at which time* the expansion of the sheet and bolt heads, and consequent pressure against one another, had resulted in a fracture of some of the bolt *heads*, and the fact that a part of the broken surface of said bolt heads was blue and a part bright, indicated that *the blue part broke at the previous overheating* and the bright part of the break took place when the explosion occurred.

It is also said that plaintiff's witness Randolph did not examine the crown sheet and bolt heads until they were brought into Court at a former trial. Inasmuch as this evidence remained in the *exclusive* possession of the defendant from the time of the accident until produced in Court, it is not difficult to understand why no previous examination had been made.

The attacks upon the credibility of the fireman, Jerry Walton, will next be noticed. On Page 16 of the opposing brief it is said of this witness:

> "The fireman, Jerry Walton, was a very pliable witness and was willing, under the lead of counsel for the plaintiff, to testify to matters necessary to the plaintiff's case, about which he had absolutely no knowledge, as his own testimony shows".

Aside from the fact that this remark is wholly beside the question here, the criticism is manifestly unjust as a reading of the testimony in question will show. Furthermore, as defendant's witness Scott unwillingly admitted, *Jerry Walton had made the statement to him that the boiler was full of water when the explosion occurred, and had made his statement a few minutes after he was blown out of the cab of the engine*, and at a time when he most certainly was *not* "under the lead of counsel for the plaintiff".

It is also claimed that the testimony of Jerry Walton should not be considered because he was not very

OOR COPY

familiar with this type of engine. We have already dealt with this question at length and need add nothing further here. (See our original brief, pages 53-55 inclusive.)

Again it is said that the testimony of this witness as to the registration of the water glass is "uncertain;" that he did not say the water stood *exactly* half an inch from the top, but measured the distance on his finger and then said it was *about* half an inch. This is claimed to be so "uncertain" as to render his testimony worthless. It is difficult to imagine how he could have stated the height of the water in the glass in more accurate terms without actually measuring it with a rule, and if he had claimed to have done that, under the circumstances, counsel might properly assail the improbability of his statement. We submit that his testimony is natural and indicative of the truth.

Upon the question of the interpretation of the evidence it is said that plaintiff's calculations as to the quantity of water in the boiler at Singer Tank are based on the quantity the boiler contained above the point three inches below the top of the crown sheet, and that therefore they are of no value. But it will be observed that these calculations were made, not by the plaintiff's witness, *but by the defendant's Superintendent of Motive Power*, who was one of its principal expert witnesses, who personally examined the remnants of the explosion immediately after it occurred, and his measurements were based upon conditions as he claimed to have found them. The purpose of the calculation was to ascertain how much water the boiler would have had to vaporize in order to reduce the water level to where defendant claimed it stood when the overheating took place, and the defendant itself furnished the figures we have given in our brief.

The further statement is made in the opposing brief that "the difference of an inch or half an inch in the height of water in a water glass, under the varying conditions of operation, as shown by the record, *may* have caused the sheet to have become uncovered."

This statement, we submit is absolutely unsupported by anything in the record. On its face, it is inherently improbable. Besides, the calculations given in our brief are upon the assumption that the water glass registered a *whole* inch from the top at Singer Tank, whereas, Jerry Walton testified it registered a *half inch*. Thus we have allowed a margin of half an inch in the height of the water in the calculations we have given.

We may add here that opposing counsel have been able to offer no reason whatsoever why these calculations are not correct, or should not be accepted as absolutely conclusive.

(b) THE ALLEGED INADMISSIBILITY OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES.

The opposing brief contains repeated vague references to alleged "improper evidence," without specifying what evidence is claimed to be improper, or for what reason, and contains also the statement that the principal argument of plaintiff in error is based upon evidence which the Court of Appeals held inadmissible. If counsel really thought that the testimony of the fireman, Walton, or of the mechanical engineer, Professor Randolph, was inadmissible under the opinion of the Court of Appeals reversing the *first* judgment, may we ask why they did not object to the introduction of said evidence *at the second trial?* All the evidence *objected to* on the second trial is contained in the record, Pages 592-602, inclusive. All of these objections, except as to the questions and answers contained on Pages 600-602 inclusive, were *overruled* by the Circuit Court, and that ruling is not subject to review here. An examination of this *alleged* improper evidence, (which the court below admitted), shows that none of it has any bearing upon the question befofe this court except the testimony of the expert witness, Scrivenor, whose testimony as a whole was objected to on the alleged ground that he was not qualified to speak as an expert. The Circuit Court, however, properly admitted his testimony and, as re-

marked, that question is not open here. The *only* testimony of the fireman, Walton, which was objected to on the second trial was his statement that if the crown sheet of the boiler had been heated to a bright red heat when he threw coal in the firebox a moment before the explosion, he believed he would have noticed an unusual glow in the firebox. This testimony was excluded by the Circuit Court and we have made no reference to it in our brief. But opposing counsel say that under the holding of the Appellate Court all of Walton's testimony is inadmissible because he was not sufficiently familiar with the engine to testify. If counsel thought that this evidence was inadmissible why, we repeat, was it that no objection was made to its introduction at the trial? The mere fact that the Railway Company has found it necessary to advance here such contentions as the above only serves to emphasize the desperate weakness of its case.

The opinion below speaks for itself and we need say nothing further upon this point.

IV. The Defendant's Contention That the Evidence Conclusively Establishes Low Water as the Cause of the Explosion.

The first portion of the opposing argument upon this point is devoted to an alleged analysis of the testimony of the plaintiff's witnesses and to an attack upon their credibility. So far as their credibility is concerned, we have dealt with that question under the third head, because, as it has been improperly injected into this case and has no bearing upon the question before the Court for decision, it would serve here only to confuse. We have also replied to the contention that the testimony of these witnesses was held inadmissible by the Court of Appeals. Certain parts of their testimony was held improper, but no part of it upon which we have relied in our original brief.

Professor Randolph's testimony, it is asserted, is based solely upon the color of the crown sheet, but we have shown in our original brief that his opinion was

based upon the previously broken bolt heads, the unbroken bolts in the highest part of the crown sheet, the general appearance of the crown sheet and other minor indications, as well as the color of the sheet.

After commenting upon plaintiff's evidence, opposing counsel then proceed to an elaborate exposition upon seven alleged "unanswerable reasons" why the explosion could have been caused only by low water. It would unduly prolong this already lengthy reply to answer them in detail. Professor Randolph's testimony upon direct and cross examination completely refutes them and demonstrates that the conditions which opposing counsel say conclusively show a low water explosion are not in any way inconsistent with the presence of water in the boiler when the explosion occurred. We especially urge the Court to read the testimony of this witness upon this question if they should feel impressed by the opposing argument.

We do not believe, however, that the Court will find any difficulty in disposing of this question, because the identical question was presented and has already been disposed of in the *Donaldson* case, *supra*, (246 U. S. 121).

In the *Donaldson* case the railroad company contended, (as the defendant does here), that the explosion was caused by low water, and that the low water was due solely to the negligence of the engineer, for whose death the action was brought. The evidence of the plaintiff consisted of the testimony of three expert witnesses, who were of opinion that the explosion was not due to low water, but that the bolt heads were too large for an oil burning engine and gave way while there was water in the boiler, and that the overheating which the crown sheet was shown to have undergone may have been caused by an accumulation of scale in the boiler as well as by an absence of water. There was also evidence of the fireman that the water glass showed water in the boiler. The Railway Company, as in the case at bar, introduced a large number of witnesses who expressed the opinion that the explosion was unquestionably caused by low water, but the Supreme Court of Washington took a different view as to the conclusive

effect of this character of evidence from the Court of Appeals of Virginia, agreeing rather with the Circuit Court of Roanoke County on the first trial.

The Supreme Court of Washington said with respect to this feature of the case:

> "The essence of appellant's contention is that the condition of the crown sheet, bolts and flues after the explosion shows conclusively as a scientific fact that the explosion could not have been due to any other cause than low water. Appellant introduced the testimony of over a dozen boiler makers, master mechanics, boiler inspectors and others, all of whom stated positively that the conditions after the explosion conclusively showed low water as the cause. We do not agree, however, that this testimony established undisputed scientific facts. The evidence at best was of a negative character and the statements of the witnesses were their opinions drawn from their previous experiences. Because they had never known the conditions shown here to occur except from a low water explosion, they concluded that they could not result otherwise. On behalf of the respondent one Hanson, fireman on the engine when the explosion occurred, testified positively that the water glass showed sufficient water on the crown sheet to prevent an explosion. An effort was made to impeach this testimony by introducing a statement prepared by the attorneys for appellant and acknowledged as correct by Hanson while he was in the hospital after the explosion. Hanson denied any knowledge of this statement, claiming that he was unconscious for days after the explosion, and had made no such statements at any time. The credibility of his testimony was clearly for the jury. We have, then, the

evidence of the only witness who was in a position to know positively whether there was water in the boiler, to the effect that the water glass indicated sufficient to prevent a low water explosion. Opposed to this is the testimony of a large number of capable experts that the explosion could have been due only to low water. Under such conditions it was clearly competent for the jury to determine that the testimony of Hanson was entitled to greater weight than that of appellant's witnesses. We conclude that on this ground appellant was not entitled to judgment, and that the denial of a new trial was not an abuse of discretion".

We have quoted the foregoing because the question there decided, *and affirmed by this Court*, is the identical question presented by the record in this case, except that instead of the fireman being impeached by contradictory written and alleged oral statements made after the explosion as was *there* the case, *here Walton was corroborated* by the unwilling testimony of one of defendant's witnesses, to the effect that immediately after the explosion Walton told him that the water glass had shown that the boiler was nearly full of water when it exploded. (Record, Page 255).

The opinions expressed by the expert witnesses for the railway company in the Donaldson case were to the effect that the blue color of the crown sheet immediately after the explosion, the quilting or pocketing of said sheet between the bolts, the fact that the threads of the crown sheet bolt holes did not strip when the crown sheet came down, and the general appearance of the fire box, crown sheet and stay bolts showed unquestionably that low water was the cause of the explosion. The expert witnesses for the plaintiff in that case expressed a contrary opinion. Under that status of the evidence this Court held that it was proper to submit

the question of recovery to the jury and judgment for the plaintiff was affirmed.

In the case at bar a number of these same arguments were advanced by defendant's expert witnesses, and all of them satisfactorily answered by the plaintiff's. In fact there was nothing about the appearance of the crown sheet which could not have been accounted for equally as well by a previous overheating of the sheet or by overheating from scale, mud or oil as by a heating at the time of the explosion from low water.

On page 426 of our Record the Government expert, Williams, testified that the only difference between the appearance of the crown sheet if the explosion had been caused by low water, and its appearance if it was caused by previous overheating, was that in his opinion the signs of the previous overheating would have been obscured by smoke and scale. He admitted, however, that he had never seen an explosion except where low water had been attributed as the cause. On the other hand plaintiff's expert witness, Professor Randolph, testified that the effect of the explosion would be to remove all soot and scale from the crown sheet. (Record Pages 519-520, 525). The same condition with respect to the absence of scale from the crown sheet after the explosion existed in the Donaldson case. (See Page 180 of the Record in that case.)

With reference to the quilting or slightly pocketed condition of the crown sheet between the bolt heads, which opposing counsel here emphasize so strongly in their brief as unmistakable evidence of a low water explosion, it may be said that the evidence in the Donaldson case showed that the crown sheet in that case was in the same condition.

It is also worthy of mention that in the Donaldson case it was testified to as a fact, and was not disputed, that the fireman can always tell whether the injector is properly working and forcing water into the boiler. (See Page 18, Donaldson Record.)

Bearing in mind that in the case at bar the fireman testified that the water glass showed that the boiler contained ample water to prevent an explosion, and that the injector was properly working, and that the plaintiff's witnesses, Professor Randolph and Arthur Scrivenor, stated that in their opinion the explosion resulted from defective bolts, and remembering also that the verdict of the jury is in favor of the plaintiff, it is obvious that the contention of the defendant that the conditions found afterwards conclusively showed low water as the sole cause of the explosion, cannot be sustained unless the Court can say, without seeing the crown sheet, that it is physically *impossible* for plaintiff's evidence to be true. This Court declined to so decide in the Donaldson case where the evidence of the Railroad was much stronger than in the case at bar, and where the physical laws applicable and questions arising under them were substantially the same. On the first trial the learned judge of the trial Court and the jury, which actually saw the remnants of the explosion in the case at bar, and were in the best position to judge of the merits of this contention of the defendant, declined to uphold it, but decided the issue in favor of the plaintiff. We respectfully submit that this Court should decline to say that this finding of the jury and trial Court is unsupported by any evidence.

V. The Defendant's Contention That the Testimony of its Witnesses That They Performed Their Duty of Inspecting the Boiler and Water Glass Conclusively Establishes That the Boiler and Water Glass Were in Safe and Proper Condition Within the Meaning of the Boiler Act.

In our original brief, (Pages 56-64), we made a careful analysis of the defendant's evidence upon this point and showed that, even conceding the truth of everything its witnesses said, still the inspections claimed to have been conducted were not such as would have revealed the defective condition of the water glass or boiler. We also called attention to decisions

of this Court in cases under the other safety appliance acts in which evidence of this character had been held by this Court not to establish that the appliances inspected were in safe and proper condition.

We now call the Court's attention to the fact that it appears from pages 156 and 157 of the record in the *Donaldson Case, supra*, that the crown sheet of the engine in that case was inspected just before the engine left on the trip on which the explosion occurred, *and the inspector testified that the crown sheet had no sags at any place between the bolts and that no bolts were leaking.*

This Court held, however, that the question of whether the boiler was unsafe was properly submitted to the jury, and therefore it resulted that this Court refused to hold that such evidence established as a matter of law that the Great Northern Railway Company had complied with its statutory duty of furnishing a boiler in proper condition and safe to operate.

This point of itself necessitates a reversal of the Court of Appeals of Virginia in the case at bar, because said Court expressly held that such evidence of inspection *did* require the finding as matter of law that the railway company had complied with its statutory duty of furnishing a boiler in proper condition and safe to operate.

But in addition to the decision of this identical question by this Court in the *Donaldson* case, it is well established by the authorities that the jury are not bound to accept the testimony of an employee *that he did what it was his duty to do*, because if he should admit that he did not do it, he would be confessing his own culpability. Therefore such testimony is universally held not to be that of a disinterested witness. It is sufficient upon this point to give the following quotation from the opinion of this Court in the case of *Texas and Pacific Railway Company v Carlin 189 U. S. 354*:

> "Upon the second ground, we are of opinion that there was evidence sufficient to go to the jury upon the question of the negligence

of the foreman in failing to discover the maul upon the bridge immediately prior to the passage of the train. The foreman himself swears that he did look along the track just prior to the coming of the train, and that he did not see any obstruction on the track, and did not see the spike maul in question. Whether he looked or not is, under the evidence, one of the material facts in the case. He says that he did, but we are of opinion that other facts proved in the case were of such a character as to make it proper to submit the question to the jury. The foreman's evidence was that of a somewhat interested witness. If the foreman did in fact neglect to perform his duty by looking over the track just prior to the coming of the train for the purpose of seeing that the bridge was clear of obstruction, it might be quite a serious matter for him in his future relations with the company. At any rate, *no man is an absolutely disinterested witness where his testimony relates to the question of the performance or non performance of a duty* which he owed on account of the position which he occupied. It was, therefore, a question for the jury as to what measure of credence should be given to his testimony".

We submit therefore that the circumstances shown by the testimony of the fireman, Walton, justified the jury in completely disregarding the testimony of defendant's employees that they performed their duty of inspecting.

VI. The Admission of Defendant That the Testimony of the Fireman Permits an Inference That the Water Glass was Unsafe, and its Contention That Notwithstanding Same the Plaintiff's Intestate was Guilty of Negligence Which was in Law the Sole Cause of the Explosion.

The opposing brief at Page 31 says:

> "There is absolutely no evidence tending to show that the water glass gauge was defective or failed to properly register the water in the boiler *except the testimony of Jerry Walton* before referred to".

We take it that this is an admission that the evidence of this witness permits a finding that the explosion occurred under circumstances where the water glass indicated water in the boiler. Defendant's contention is that the conditions found after the accident conclusively showed low water, as the cause of the explosion, (with which contention we have already dealt), and that therefore the water glass must have registered incorrectly. They then contend that if this was the case, the decedent engineer *should have discovered* the defective condition, and his failure to discover it was negligence which was the *sole* cause of the explosion.

In our original brief, (Pages 77-81), we called attention to the several explosion cases in which recovery was upheld upon the theory of a defective water glass, though in those cases *contributory* negligence would have been a complete defense.

In the *Donaldson* case, supra, this Court held that it was proper to submit to the jury the question whether the failure of the railroad to have a fusible plug installed in the crown sheet contributed in part to cause the explosion. The function of the fusible plug was to warn the engineer of low water. The railroad contended that if the engineer allowed the water to get low, this was negligence which was the *sole* cause of the explosion, but that contention was rejected.

Applying this same principle to the railroad's last named contention in the case at bar, it would seem obvious that the Court cannot say, *as matter of law*, that the failure of the engineer to discover the defect in the water glass was the sole cause of the explosion, and that the defective condition of said water glass did not contribute, *in part*, to cause same.

The principle applied to the facts in the case of *Grand Trunk Ry. Co. v Lindsay, 233 U.S. 42*, serves also to dispose of this contention of the defendant. In that case the plaintiff was injured while attempting to effect a coupling of two cars which would not couple automatically upon impact. After this defective condition was known to the plaintiff, there was evidence that he gave the engineer a "come ahead" signal and then stepped between the cars. The railroad contended that such conduct constituted negligence on his part and that such negligence, intervening between the condition of the coupler and the injury, as matter of law, constituted the *sole* cause of the injury. In disposing of this contention this Court said that "in the view most favorable to the railroad, the case was one of *concurring* negligence; that is, was one where the injury complained of was caused both by the failure of the Railway Company to comply with the Safety Appliance Act and by the contributory negligence of the switchman in going between the cars".

In our original brief we referred to several additional decisions of this Court, applying the same principle to various other situations. The defendant does not cite a single authority in support of its contention that the defective water glass must be held not to contribute in part as a legal cause of the explosion, and we respectfully submit that no such authority can be found.

CONCLUSION

The case here turns upon the construction of the Boiler Act. It was in distinguishing this act from the other safety appliance acts, and in holding that the duty thereby imposed was discharged by evidence of inspection that the Court of Appeals of Virginia committed its first and chief error. The manifest errors contained in its recitals of evidence are clearly due to its view of the nature of the duty imposed by this act, since if its construction of the act had been correct,

the mistakes made in reciting the evidence would not have been material. The rule laid down by this court for determining the question of the sufficiency of evidence prevails in Virginia. In the recent case of City of Norfolk v Anthony, 117 Va., 783, it was said:

> "It is furthermore well settled by the Supreme Court of the United States and this Court, by practically an unbroken line of decisions, that negligence only becomes a question of law to be taken from the jury when the facts are such that fairminded men can only draw one inference therefrom. If fairminded men, from the proofs submitted, may honestly differ as to the negligence charged, the question is not one of law, but one of fact, to be determined by the jury under proper instructions from the Court".

Considering the evidence under this rule, and applying thereto the principle of construction of the Boiler Act which was established in the *Donaldson* Case, supra, there can be no doubt as to conclusion to be reached.

We earnestly submit that the judgment complained of must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A. B. HUNT,
A. P. STAPLES,
Attorneys for plaintiff in error.

ROANOKE, VA.
November 21, 1918.

Office Supreme Court, U. S.
MAR 23 1918
JAMES D. MAHER,
CLERK.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1917

No. 3[redacted]82

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADM'X OF A. W. ANDREWS,
Deceased, Plaintiff in Error

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
Defendant in Error

In Error to the Roanoke County Circuit Court, State of Virginia

BRIEF OF COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF IN ERROR

THE STONE PRINTING & MFG. CO., ROANOKE, VA.

INDEX TO BRIEF.

		Page of Brief
1.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1—22 incl.
	(a) Pleadings	3— 7 incl.
	(b) Verdict	7
	(c) Judgment	7
	(d) Specification of error	8—10 incl.
	(e) The evidence	10—22 incl.
2.	BRIEF OF THE ARGUMENT	22—32 incl.
3.	ARGUMENT	32—81 incl.
	I. The Federal direction presented and how considered	32—33
	II. The Duty imposed by the Federal Safe Boiler Statute is absolute	33—48 incl.
	III. Rule applicable for consideration of evidence on demurrer to evidence under Virginia Practice	48
	IV. Evidence of circumstances of explosion *standing alone*, raises inference of defective boiler or defective water glass as cause of explosion	48—64 incl.
	V. If evidence of circumstances raises inference that explosion caused wholly or in part by defective boiler or water glass, plaintiff entitled to recover	64—71 incl.
	VI. Evidence of circumstances of explosion in connection with *plaintiff's* expert testimony justifies a jury finding that boiler unsafe *before beginning of trip*	71—74 incl.
	VII. Evidence of circumstances of explosion in connection with *defendant's* expert testimony, justifies a jury finding that water glass unsafe before beginning of trip	74—76 incl.
	VIII. Fact that explosion may have been caused in part by negligence of plaintiff's intestate is no defense if evidence justifies a jury finding that it was caused *in part* by an unsafe boiler or water glass	77—81 incl.
	Conclusion	81—82

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

NAME OF CASE	Cited in Brief, Page
Virginian Ry. Co. *vs.* Bell, 118 Va. 495	3
Western U. Tel. Co. *vs.* Crovo, 220 U. S. 364	3
N. & S. Turnpike Co. *vs.* Virginia, 225 U. S. 264	3
Coe *vs.* Armour Fertilizer Wks., 237 U. S. 413	3, 22
C. R. I. & P. Ry. *vs.* Devine, 239 U. S. 52	22
S. A. L. Ry. Co. *vs.* Padgett, 236 U. S. 668	22
Myers *vs.* Pittsburgh Coal Co., 233 U. S. 184	22, 28, 33, 67
C. & O. Ry. Co. *vs.* McCabe, 213 U. S. 207	22
La. Nav. Co. *vs.* Oyster Com., 226 U. S. 99	22
St. L. I. M. & S. Ry. *vs.* Taylor, 210 U. S. 281	23, 35
C. B. & Q. Ry. Co. *vs.* U. S., 220 U. S. 559	23, 36, 42, 44, 77.
Delk *vs.* St. L. & S. F. Ry., 220 U. S. 580	23
Tex. & P. Ry. *vs.* Rigsby, 241 U. S. 33	23, 37, 40
Spokane, etc., Ry. *vs.* Campbell, 241 U. S. 497	23, 28, 32, 37, 40, 45, 62, 64, 66, 79.
Minneapolis, etc., Ry. *vs.* Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66	23, 28, 40, 45, 66.
I. C. Ry. *vs.* Williams, 242 U. S. 462	23, 42
G. N. Ry. Co. *vs.* Otos, 239 U. S. 349	23, 46
Mason *vs.* Fearson, 9 How. 248, 13 L. Ed. 125	23, 47
Logan *vs.* United States, 144 U. S. 263	23, 47
U. S. *vs.* Mooney, 116 U. S. '04	23, 47
Kepner *vs.* United States, 195 U. S. 100	23, 47
White *vs.* Am. Nat. L. Ins. Co., 115 Va. 307	23, 48
Grand Trunk Ry. *vs.* Lindsay, 233 U. S. 42	28, 45, 64
Souden *vs.* Fore River Co., 112 N. E. 82	28, 70
W. & G. Ry. Co. *vs.* Gladmon, 15 Wal. 401	32, 81
T. & P. Ry. *vs.* Gentry, 163 U. S. 353	32, 81
Great N. Ry. *vs.* Knapp, 240 U. S. 464	33
B. & O. Ry. *vs.* Wilson, 242 U. S. 295	37
C. R. I. & P. Ry. *vs.* Brown, 229 U. S. 317	40
San Antonio, etc., Ry. *vs.* Wagner, 241 U. S. 476	40
Atl. City Ry. *vs.* Parker, 242 U. S. 56	40
Binns *vs.* U. S., 194 U. S. 486	42
Hough *vs.* Moreland, 169 S. W. 467	80
N. Pac. Ry. *vs.* Vaughan, 165 S. W., 7 N. C. C. A. 622	80

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1917

No. 341.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX
OF A. W. ANDREWS, *Deceased*,
Plaintiff in Error

vs.

VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
Defendant in Error.

IN ERROR TO THE ROANOKE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

BRIEF OF COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF IN ERROR.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

This writ of error is prosecuted to obtain a reversal of a final judgment of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, in favor of the defendant in error, who was defendant below, which was rendered upon defendant in error's demurrer to the evidence in an action instituted by plaintiff in error to recover damages sustained by the widow and four infant children of Arthur W. Andrews, who was killed while in the discharge of his duties as locomotive engineer in the employment of defendant in error.

The action was originally commenced in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County and the declaration was filed on the first Monday in April, 1914. The first trial was had in October, 1914, which resulted in a verdict of the jury in favor of plaintiff in error. (Record, Page 574.) The motion of the defendant in error to set aside this verdict and grant it a new trial, upon the ground, among others, that the verdict was contrary to the law and the evidence, *was overruled* by the Circuit Court and judgment entered in favor of the plaintiff in error. (Record, Page 574.) This judgment upon writ of error, the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia reversed, and awarded a new trial, upon the ground that under the Act of Congress requiring common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto, a recovery could only be founded upon proof of *negligence*, that the evidence was not sufficient to sustain a finding that defendant in error *was negligent*, and that the verdict was, therefore, contrary to the law and the evidence.

By an order entered at the May, 1916, term of the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, the case was, by agreement of parties, removed to the Circuit Court of Roanoke County. (Record, Page 589.) On June 16th, 1916, the second trial was had. At this trial, the plaintiff and defendant each offered, respectively, the same evidence they had introduced at the first trial, the defendant demurred to the evidence, and the plaintiff joined therein. (Record, Pages 590-591.) The sole purpose of the second trial was to secure a final judgment which could be reviewed by this Court, since a writ of error did not lie to the judgment of the Court of Appeals allowing a new trial, as it was not final in form, though in substance it was, because the Court of Appeals had held that the evidence was not sufficient to sustain the verdict and judgment of the Circuit Court in favor of the plaintiff, and this became the law of the case, precluding the Circuit Court from again

entering judgment for plaintiff unless the evidence should be materially different, which it would not have been.

Virginian Railway Company vs. Bell, 118 Va. at Page 495.

The Circuit Court, although it regarded the evidence sufficient under its construction of the Federal Boiler Act, was compelled to follow the holding of the Court of Appeals, and therefore sustained the defendant's demurrer to the evidence and entered judgment thereon in its favor. (See opinion of the lower Court, Record, Page 604.)

This judgment, entered in accordance with the opinion of the Court of Appeals, said Court, of course, refused to review by writ of error and declined to take jurisdiction. (Record, Page 606.) The present writ of error, therefore, is directed to the judgment of the Circuit Court, entered June 16th, 1916.

Western Union Telegraph Co. vs. Crovo, 220 U. S. 364.

Norfolk & Southern Turnpike Company vs. Virginia, 225 U. S. 264.

Coe vs. Armour Fertilizer Works, 237 U. S. 413.

PLEADINGS.

The declaration, consisting of seven counts, is grounded on defendant's violation of the Federal Safe Boiler Act, resulting in the death of plaintiff's intestate, and defendant's consequent liability therefor under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. The title of the Boiler Act is as follows:

> *"An act to promote the safety of employees and "travelers upon railroads by compelling common "carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip "their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and "appurtenances thereto."*

Section 2 of the Act (36 Stat. 913, U. S. Comp. Stat., 1916, Section 8631), provides as follows:

"From and after the first day of July, nineteen "hundred and eleven, it shall be unlawful for any "common carrier, its officers or agents, subject to this "act, to use any locomotive engine propelled by steam "power in moving interstate or foreign commerce "unless the boiler of said locomotive and appur- "tenances thereof are in proper condition and safe "to operate in the service to which the same is put, "that the same may be employed in the active service "of such carrier in moving traffic without unnecessary "peril to life or limb; and all boilers shall be in- "spected from time to time in accordance with the "provisions of this Act, and be able to withstand "such test or tests as may be prescribed in the rules "and regulations hereinafter provided for."

The water glass is admittedly an appurtenance of the boiler, within the meaning of the act. (Record, Page 515.)

The first count of the declaration (Record, Page 33), avers that on November 14th, 1912, the defendant, the Virginian Railway Company, was operating a certain freight train bound from Roanoke, Virginia, to Princeton, West Virginia, over its line of railroad extending between these points; that the plaintiff's intestate, Arthur W. Andrews, was the engineer of the locomotive, No. 469, which was drawing said train; that the said train and said plaintiff's intestate were both engaged in interstate commerce; that under these circumstances the defendant was under duty to the plaintiff to have the boiler of said locomotive in proper condition and safe to operate in the service of drawing said train; that said defendant violated said duty and had said locomotive equipped with an unsafe boiler, the elements of unsafety being that the said boiler was improperly constructed; that the material of which the crown sheet and stay bolts were built was faulty and defective; that said crown sheet was weak and had been previously burned or overheated; that the stay bolts and crown bolts were weak and unsafe, had been previously burned or overheated and broken in service and were unable to with-

stand the strain of service; that while the plaintiff's intestate was engaged in the performance of his duties as engineer the crown sheet of said boiler suddenly gave way, allowing the water and steam to escape from the boiler into the cab of the engine, scalding and injuring the plaintiff's intestate so that he died therefrom on the following day; that the intestate's widow and four infant children ranging in age from one to seven years survive his death, and by reason of being deprived of the support and contributions from his earnings, and his services, etc., they have been greatly damaged by the death of the husband and father. The damages are laid at $50,000.00.

The fifth count (Record, Page 584) is substantially the same as the first, the only difference being the omission of the allegations as to certain elements of unsafeness of the boiler, the only element embraced in the fifth count being that the stay bolts and crown bolts had been previously overheated and burned and broken, and were weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the strain to which they were normally subjected in service. In other respects, the first and fifth counts are the same.

The sixth count (Record, Page 585), is the same except that it merely alleges that the stay bolts, crown bolts and crown sheet of the boiler were weak and unsafe and unable to withstand the strain of ordinary steam pressure, without specifying the cause of the weakness, and that said bolts and sheet failed and gave way at a time when there was ample water in the boiler to prevent said bolts and sheets from being weakened by overheating.

The third count (Record, Page 37) contains the same general allegations as the foregoing, but is based upon the averment that the water glass, being unsafe and not in proper condition, misled the engineer and fireman into thinking that the boiler contained an ample supply of water when in fact it did not; that by reason of the absence of a sufficient quantity of water in the boiler the crown sheet and bolts became overheated and gave way under

the steam pressure. The water glass is alleged to have been unsafe because the openings through which the water circulates between the boiler and water glass had been stopped up.

The seventh count (Record, Page 587), also based upon the allegation that the water glass was unsafe, contains the same averments except that it does not attempt to specify in what particular the water glass was unsafe. The charge is that a few moments before the explosion the fireman observed the water glass and it indicated that the boiler was over three-fourths full, and that before the water thus indicated to have been in the boiler could have been vaporized into steam and thus consumed in sufficient quantity to reduce the water level to the point of exposing the crown sheet, the explosion occurred.

The second and fourth counts were abandoned at the first trial and need not be considered.

To the plaintiff's declaration, the defendant pleaded not guilty (Record, Page 603), and after all the evidence was completed, demurred to the evidence, upon the following five alleged grounds (Record, Pages 590-591):

(1) "That said evidence does not show that "the defendant was guilty of any negligence which "was the cause of the accident.

(2) "That it appears from the evidence that "the said defendant discharged its duty to the "plaintiff's intestate by turning over to him a "locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances "in proper condition and safe to operate, in the "service to which the same was put.

(3) "That the evidence shows that the ex-"plosion which resulted in the injury and death of "the plaintiff's intestate was caused by low water "due to the sole negligence of the plaintiff's in-"testate.

(4) "That the evidence shows that if said ex-"plosion was not caused by low water, that it was

"due to the sole negligence of the plaintiff's in-
"testate in his failure to perform his duty of
"properly inspecting said boiler.

(5) "That if the evidence fails to show that the
"accident which resulted in the injury and death
"of plaintiff's intestate was not due to the sole neg-
"ligence of the plaintiff's intestate, as above
"specified, that it necessarily shows that the injury
"was the result of an accident which was unforeseen
"and could not be guarded against, and which was
"ordinarily incident to the employment of the
"plaintiff's intestate, or of which he knew, or should
"have known, the risk of danger from which he
"assumed."

The plaintiff's joinder in the demurrer to the evidence is as follows (Record, Page 591):

"And the plaintiff says that the matters afore-
"said to the jurors in form aforesaid, shown in
"evidence, are sufficient in law to maintain the
"issue joined on the part of the plaintiff.

"Wherefore, forasmuch as the said defendant
"has given no answer to the same, the said plain-
"tiff demands that the defendant be convicted,
"that the jury be required to assess her damages
"and that judgment in her favor against the de-
"fendant be entered thereon."

THE VERDICT.

The jury found in favor of the plaintiff, subject to the opinion of the Court on the demurrer to the evidence, and fixed the damages of the widow and four children at four thousand dollars each. (Record, Page 603.)

THE JUDGMENT.

The lower court sustained the demurrer to the evidence and entered final judgment for defendant. The reasons for

so doing were thus stated by the Court (Record, Page 604):—

> "Because the evidence is the same as that introduced at the first trial upon which the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff, upon which verdict this Court rendered judgment in favor of the plaintiff. The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia reversed the said judgment of this Court and in its opinion said that the evidence was insufficient to support the judgment of this Court. Under the well established rule, this thereupon became the law of the case, so far as this Court is concerned and is conclusive and binding.
>
> "Judgment is, therefore, given for the defendant against the plaintiff."

The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia having refused a writ of error to the foregoing judgment and having declined to take jurisdiction (Record, Page 606), a writ of error was prayed for from this Court, which was allowed by the Presiding and Only Judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County. (Record, Pages 605-606.)

With her petition for writ of error, the plaintiff in error, filed the following assignment and specification of errors. (Record, Pages 607-608.)

SPECIFICATION OF ERROR.

> (1) "The Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, erred in sustaining the defendant's demurrer to the evidence, setting aside the verdict of the jury in favor of the plaintiff and entering final judgment in favor of the defendant, and in not overruling said demurrer to the evidence and in not entering judgment in favor of the plaintiff for the amount of the damages assessed to her by the said verdict of the jury.
>
> "The said plaintiff, as will appear from the transcript of the record and proceedings in this case, asserted the right to recover damages of the

"defendant, under and by virtue of two certain "acts of Congress, the first approved April 22d, "1908, known as the Federal Employers' Liability "Act (35 U. S. St. at L. 65, c. 149), and the other "approved February 17th, 1911, known as the "Federal Safe Boiler Act (36 Stat. 913). The "said plaintiff, therefore, claimed in this case "rights, privileges, and immunities under the "Statutes and Laws of the United States, which "were denied by the said decision and judgment.

"The said errors in the said judgment are more "particularly set forth as follows: that is to say, "the said Circuit Court erred in sustaining the "said demurrer to the evidence and entering "judgment for defendant and in not entering judg- "ment for the plaintiff, for the following reasons:

(a) "The evidence was sufficient to justify the "jury in finding that when the locomotive engine "No. 469 was delivered to plaintiff's intestate at "Roanoke, on the night of the injury, the stay bolts "and crown sheet of the boiler were not in proper "condition and safe to operate in the service of "drawing the freight train to which it was attached "and that said condition was the proximate cause, "or one of the proximate causes, of the death of "plaintiff's intestate.

(b) "The evidence was sufficient to justify the "jury in finding that when the locomotive engine "No. 469 was delivered to plaintiff's intestate at "Roanoke on the night of the injury, the water "glass, an appurtenance of the boiler of said loco- "motive, was not in proper condition and safe to "operate in the service of registering the quantity "of water in the boiler of said locomotive, while "drawing the freight train aforesaid, and that said "condition of said water glass was the proximate "cause, or one of the proximate causes, of the death "of plaintiff's intestate.

(c) "The evidence as to the circumstances "under which the explosion occurred was sufficient

"to bring the case within the influence of the "maxim, *res ipsa loquitur*, and justified an infer- "ence that the death of the plaintiff's intestate re- "sulted wholly or in part from the explosion of the "locomotive boiler due to an unsafe water glass, or "to unsafe stay bolts or unsafe crown sheet, or a "combination of two or more of said causes, and "that said unsafe condition of said water glass or "stay bolts or crown sheet, or crown bolts, or of "two or more of them, was due to the defendant's "violation of the duties imposed upon it under the "Federal Safe Boiler Statute (36 Stat. 913) to "have the said boiler and appurtenances thereof, "of the locomotive No. 469 in proper condition and "safe to operate in the service of pulling the freight "train it was then engaged in pulling.

(d) "The proper construction of the Federal "Safe Boiler Statute (36 Stat. 913) renders the "defendant liable for an injury resulting from any "improper or unsafe condition of the water glass "gauge, an appurtenance of the boiler, whether "said unsafe or improper condition comes into ex- "istence in transit during the run or whether same "existed before the commencement of the run, and "the evidence justified a finding, on the part of the "jury, that the death of plaintiff's intestate was "caused either wholly or in part, by unsafe stay "bolts or crown sheet or unsafe water glass."

THE EVIDENCE.

Since the controlling question here does not involve the weight of the evidence, but only the determination of what ultimate facts the evidence tends to prove, the following statement is confined to such ultimate facts and ignores all evidence tending to contradict the same.

On November 14th, 1912, Arthur W. Andrews had been in defendant's employment as locomotive engineer for about a year. He was given a regular freight run between Roanoke, Virginia, and Princeton, West Virginia. He was 38 years of age and was regarded as a careful engineer. (Record,

Page 256.) On the night he was killed, he reported for duty at the Roanoke yards about eight p. m. and at eight forty-five, his train left Roanoke, westbound, and proceeded on its journey. In a very short time, something over an hour, at a point eighteen miles from Roanoke, the boiler exploded, scalding and injuring Andrews so badly that he died therefrom in a few hours. The fireman was the only surviving eye-witness.

As an appreciation of the evidence as to the circumstances surrounding the explosion requires some familiarity with the working principles of the injector and water glass, both appurtenances of the boiler, we will, at this point, endeavor to explain them.

The injector is the appliance which replenishes the boiler with water to take the place of that used up in generating steam. This reserve supply is carried in a tank located on the tender. Water flows from this tank, through a faucet or valve, into the combining tube of the injector, (a cylindrical pipe about four inches in diameter), where it is made to combine with the steam in such a manner as to condense it and form a water jet, which imparts to the mixed current a sufficient force or momentum to deliver it into the boiler. The quantity of steam and water admitted into the combining tube is regulated by opening or closing valves, similar to those of ordinary water spigots. (For diagram and explanation, see Standard Dictionary, "injector.") If the quantity of steam admitted is too great for the quantity of water admitted, or vice versa, the excess escapes through the overflow or waste pipe. Sometimes, though very rarely, the quantity of water admitted is so grossly out of proportion to the quantity of steam, or vice versa, that the injector fails to work, and both steam and water escape through the overflow. When this occurs, according to the railroad term applicable, the injector "breaks," and the proper procedure is to shut off both steam and water and again turn them on in proper relative quantities, so that they will "catch." If the in-

jector starts working properly, it necessarily continues to work unless the steam pressure falls too low. (Record, Pages 267, 270, 281.) The injectors on the locomotive involved in this case would work properly even when the steam pressure was as low as 100 pounds. (Record, Page 431.) If the injector did "break" for any cause, however, the engineer or fireman could tell it instantly, because of the hissing sound of escaping steam, whereas, the sound given forth when working properly is a solid ringing sound easily audible in the engine cab. (Record, Pages 46, 48, 71, 72, 243, 431.).

The engine was equipped with two injectors, one on the right and the other on the left side of the cab, but one injector is all that is required to supply ample water to the boiler. The other is for use only in the event that the one being utilized should get out of repair. (Record, Pages 45, 54, 264, 277, 290, 377.)

The water glass gauge occupies a vertical position on the boiler head, and is easily visible to the engineer and fireman while discharging their duties in the engine cab. There are two openings leading from this gauge into the boiler, one opening at the top and the other at the bottom of the water glass. This is necessary in order to obtain a correct register of the water level inside the boiler. From the laws of physics, it is obvious that if the top opening becomes closed or stopped up, the steam pressure from the boiler, through the lower opening, will force the water high up into the water glass, whereas, if said top opening remains open, the pressure from the boiler will be exerted through it and, by neutralizing the pressure exerted through the lower opening, a proper water level will be maintained. If, on the other hand, the lower opening becomes closed, not only is the water which the glass contains prevented from re-entering the boiler if the water level of the boiler drops, but the steam which is forced into the glass through the upper opening is being constantly condensed into water,

causing a gradual rise in the water level indicated by the glass.

In the ordinary operation of the engine, evaporation of the water into steam causes a precipitation of lime and similar mineral substances contained in the water, which forms a deposit or hard scale on the crown sheet and all metallic surfaces with which the boiling water comes in contact. This scale is being constantly deposited, in minute particles, on the surface of the openings which lead from the water glass into the boiler, and must be cleaned off in order to maintain the water glass guage in proper condition. The evidence was uncontradicted that if the openings had been in anything like proper condition when the engine was put into service at Roanoke an hour or more before the explosion, the deposit of scale in the openings could not have been sufficiently rapid to stop up the openings in the time which elapsed before the explosion. (Record, Pages 118, 119.).

The Crown Sheet of the boiler is that portion exposed directly to the fire. In the locomotive in question, it was made of iron, three-eighths of an inch in thickness, and was supported in place, from above, by one-inch wrought iron stay bolts, spaced four by four inches. Each bolt, therefore, supported the strain exerted by the steam pressure upon sixteen square inches of the crown sheet's surface, which, at the boiler pressure of 185 pounds to the square inch, was a strain of 2,960 pounds on each bolt. It was not disputed that the crown sheet supported as it was, if properly constructed of proper material, should have withstood more than twelve times the boiler pressure, if said sheet and bolts had been in proper condition.

An examination of the crown sheet and bolt heads by plaintiff's expert witnesses led them to the opinion that the said sheet and stay bolts had been overheated *on some occasion prior to the time of the explosion.* Defendant's experts, on the other hand, thought that the appearance of the wreckage indicated that the explosion was caused by

the crown sheet and bolts having been overheated *at the time of the explosion.*

Under this state of expert testimony, plaintiff contends that either one of two grounds of liability is necessarily established by the evidence in this case:

> (a) "*The evidence warranted the jury in finding "that the stay bolts were unsafe and had been pre-"viously overheated and damaged and this caused "the explosion; also*
>
> (b) "*The evidence of the circumstances attend-"ing the explosion, that is, that the water glass "showed ample water in the boiler, taken in connec-"tion with defendant's opinion evidence that the "wreckage indicated absence of water in the boiler at "the time of the explosion, warranted the jury in "inferring that the water glass gauge was not in "proper condition and safe to operate.*"

The evidence of the circumstances of the explosion consists of the testimony of the fireman, Jerry Walton, and the testimony of defendant's witness, Scott, that Walton told him immediately following the explosion, that the boiler had exploded when the water glass showed it was full of water.

Walton's testimony was in substance as follows:

The witness had been a locomotive fireman for about eighteen months last preceding the time of the accident, and had fired on other engines of the same class and kind as the one on which the explosion occurred. (Record, Pages 45, 54.) He was the fireman on Locomotive No. 469 when the explosion occurred. On leaving Roanoke, at the beginning of the trip, the plaintiff's intestate, who was engineer, turned on the right injector. (Record, Page 45.) One injector, if working at full capacity, would always supply to the boiler as much or more water than the engine would consume. (Record, Page 45, 54.) At his position in the cab, the witness could clearly hear the injector, and

could easily tell from the sound it gave forth whether it was working properly and forcing water into the boiler. (Record, Pages 45, 46.) This he could do, because when the injector "breaks"—that is, when the steam which is admitted into the combining tube of the injector fails to "catch," or combine with, the water,—both water and steam escape and the escaping steam makes a hissing noise, whereas when properly working a solid, ringing sound is produced. (Record, Page 48.) The witness listened to the injector constantly, and it was at all times, up to the very moment of the explosion, working properly and forcing water into the boiler. (Record, Pages 45, 46, 47, 48, 49.) (As to whether the injector was working *at full capacity*, this witness does not attempt to say.) Upon leaving Roanoke, he looked at the water glass gauge, and it then showed the boiler to be about half full of water. (Record, Page 45.) He observed it at intervals during the trip, and the water level in the glass increased steadily up to the time he looked at it last. (Record, Pages 55, 57, 58.) The last time he looked at the glass was as they were passing Singer Tank, when the water registered about half an inch from the top of the glass. (Record, Page 48.) This was, according to his estimate, about three or four minutes before the explosion. (Record, Pages 54, 58.)

A moment before the explosion occurred, this witness threw in several shovelfuls of coal, and the injector was working properly at that time. (Record, Page 47.) As he was getting back on his bench and was in the act of leaning out of the window, the explosion occurred. (Record, Pages 47, 48.) He was blown out of the window and the next thing he knew he lit on his face and breast. There was a great deal of water blown into the cab and the witness' clothes were wet all over. From where he was thrown he could not see Andrews, but could hear him struggling in the dark. When the witness was found by the defendant's witness, Scott, the conductor, he told Scott that the boiler

had exploded when it was full of water. (Scott's testimony, Record, Page 255.)

For proof of the quantity of water that the boiler contained when the water glass stood at the point indicated by the fireman's testimony, the plaintiff was compelled to rely upon the evidence of defendant's witness Slayton, who was the Company's Superintendent of Motive Power. This witness had made calculations on the witness stand at a former trial to determine this fact, and when the case was tried, as shown by the record now before the Court, he had, since the former trial, made accurate calculations from drawings and blue prints in the office of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the builders of the engine. (Record, Page 376.) These calculations showed that when the water glass registered one inch from the top of the glass, the boiler contained 1,296 gallons above the point three inches below the top of the crown sheet, which was the point where the water stood in the boiler when the crown sheet was overheated. (Record, Page 376.) Therefore, for the crown sheet to have been exposed from lack of water at the time of the explosion would have required the consumption by evaporation of 1,296 gallons of water after the fireman observed the water glass at Singer Tank, in addition to the water being supplied by the injector in the meantime,—which the evidence shows was impossible.

The defendant's evidence also established the distance between Singer Tank and the place where the explosion occurred which was claimed by defendant to be two and one-half miles. (Record, Page 253.) While the fireman estimated that only three or four minutes elapsed after he looked at the water glass at Singer Tank until the explosion occurred, still, if the above distance between the two points be taken as correct, since the fireman stated that the train was traveling only eighteen or twenty miles per hour (Record, Page 58), seven and a half to eight and one-third minutes may be taken as an accurate statement of the time which actually transpired.

The evidence is conclusive that the boiler could not have vaporized 1,296 gallons of water in eight and one-third minutes, even if the injector had not been working during this time, as was admitted by defendant's said witness, Slayton. This witness at first stated that the 1,296 gallons could have been consumed. (Record, Page 377.) When confronted, however, with the fact that the utmost capacity of the injector to supply water to the boiler was $116\frac{2}{3}$ gallons per minute and with the further fact that every witness in the case had testified that one injector can always furnish as much or more water than the boiler can vaporize, and that, therefore, the greatest quantity of water that the engine could vaporize was $116\frac{2}{3}$ gallons per minute, he realized that his statement was palpably erroneous and admitted that the 1,296 gallons could not have been used up in that time. (Record, Pages, 377, 378, 379.) As a matter of fact, the engine does not ordinarily consume more than 100 gallons of water per minute, and in traveling between Singer Tank and the place where the explosion occurred would not have consumed more than eight hundred gallons. (Record, Page 378.) Defendant's foreman of engines testified that between Roanoke and the place of the accident, engines of the type in question would ordinarily consume six thousand gallons of water. (Record, Page 292.) As this distance was eighteen miles, the average consumption at this rate would be $333\frac{1}{3}$ gallons per mile, or $833\frac{1}{3}$ gallons between Singer Tank and the place of the explosion. Thus defendant's own estimate of the average per mile consumption of water by engines of this type agrees with its per minute estimate, each leading to the enclusion that only about eight hundred gallons could have been consumed after leaving Singer Tank until the explosion occurred.

Taking up the expert testimony given by witnesses who examined the crown sheet and bolt heads after the explosion, as it is not regarded as necessary to consume the Court's time with a consideration of the relative weight or merits of the directly contrary views expressed by the witnesses for

the plaintiff and defendant, respectively, we will call attention only to the testimony of plaintiff's witnesses on this subject. By demurring to the evidence, the defendant has conceded the truth of plaintiff's evidence, and all reasonable inferences therefrom, and has waived its evidence in conflict therewith; so the only question here is whether in the light of these admissions and waivers, there was enough evidence to sustain the plaintiff's verdict.

Plaintiff introduced two mechanical engineers, Arthur Scrivenor and L. S. Randolph, who examined the crown sheet and bolt heads of the exploded boiler, which were introduced into evidence and were before the trial court and jury.

Arthur Scrivenor, after stating his experience of about twenty-five years in connection with the construction of boilers and in foundry work and machine shops, expressed the opinion that the appearance of the crown sheet did not indicate that the explosion occurred from low water, but that, in his opinion, the slight bags shown in the sheet were caused by the sheet having been overheated on some previous occasion. (Record, Page 105.) He testified from scientific text books that the bolts which broke, if they had been in proper condition and of good material, should have sustained greater strain than they were subjected to by the boiler pressure, unless the bolts and sheet had been heated to a higher degree of temperature than a bright red heat, i. e., white heat. (Record, Pages 90, 91.) He further stated that if the sheet had been heated to a white heat, its appearance would have been very different from what it was, that instead of the blue color, it would have been brownish red, and instead of being smooth it would have been scaly and rough, and that, from the appearance it presented, he did not think that the sheet could have been heated to a greater temperature than 1,000 to 1,200 degrees, Fahrenheit. (Record, Pages 88, 89.) The tables in Kent's "Mechanical Engineers Pocket book" showed that at 1,300 degrees, F.,

good fibrous wrought iron should stand a strain of 6,000 pounds per square inch. (Record, Page 90.)

L. S. Randolph testified that he had learned the trade of machinist in the shops of the B. & O. R. R. Co., and after spending three years there, he subsequently graduated as a mechanical engineer at the Stevens Institute of Technology; that he afterwards had a great deal of experience as Superintendent of Motive Power and in other positions with five different railroads, and that for the last twenty-one years he had been Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, a State Institution, and had also done considerable consulting work.

This witness stated that he had made an examination of the crown sheet of the exploded locomotive; that he saw no indication that the explosion was caused by low water; that the sheet's appearance indicated that it had never been heated above a dull red heat, because it was blue in color and smooth, whereas, if it had been heated sufficiently hot to cause an explosion in a boiler in proper condition, the sheet would have been rough and reddish in color; that the sheet still had the mill scale on it, which was made at the time the sheet was rolled, and this scale would have been destroyed if heated above the dull red (Record, Pages 113, 114); that at a dull red heat, sound bolts of that size should have withstood a strain of between eight and ten thousand pounds, whereas the strain on each bolt at the maximum boiler pressure was only 2,960 pounds and that if the bolts had been in good condition, they could not have broken from being overheated unless they had been heated hotter than a bright red. (Record, Page 115.) The witness stated, furthermore, that when the crown sheet is in the engine, it occupies a sloping position, the forward end being higher than the rear end, and, therefore, in the event of low water, the forward end would be first exposed; that an examination showed that some bolts in the highest part of the crown sheet had not been broken, while others lower down had broken; that the ones which did not break

would have been the first to become exposed if there had been low water at the time of the explosion, and consequently would have been subjected to the heat longer than those which did break; and that this condition indicated that the explosion was not caused by low water. (Record, Pages 119-121.)

This witness also stated that the line of demarkation in color on the broken surface of three of the twelve bolt heads which the defendant introduced in evidence, showed that a part of the fracture had occurred when the bolt heads were hot, and the balance of the fracture occurred when they were at the ordinary boiler temperature, or "cold." (Record, Pages 136, 137.) This indicated that the bolt heads had been previously overheated and were cracked at that time, and that when the crown sheet failed the balance of the fracture took place. Thus, twenty-five per cent. of the bolt heads which the defendant selected and brought into Court showed that they had been previously broken. If the same percentage of the 160 bolts which broke were in this condition, then there were about forty broken bolts in the boiler previous to the explosion. This, we submit, is an inference which the plaintiff is entitled to have drawn from the above testimony, and this was sufficient, in and of itself, to have caused the explosion. (Record, Pages 134, 135.) This witness also testified as to the various defects in material or workmanship which might cause the explosion of a locomotive boiler.

The testimony of both plaintiff's and defendant's witnesses showed that engines are commonly in service, the crown sheets of which have been overheated on some previous occasion, said sheets having the small bags between the bolts and presenting an appearance similar to the smaller bags found on the crown sheet in this case. (Record, Pages 144, 145, 421, 422; 457, 497.) Two of the boiler men from the Norfolk & Western Railway Company stated that that road had in service at the time of the trial twenty-five or thirty engines in that condition, the crown sheets of

which had been previously overheated. (Record, Page 457, 497.)

The following tests as to the quality of the stay bolt iron going into boilers built at the Baldwin Locomotive Works are shown to have been customarily made:

The material of which the bolts are made originally consists of a square billet of iron. From this billet, 15 to 20 bars, approximately fifteen feet in length, are rolled and placed in a bundle, with a serial number stamped on them for identification. This bundle is called a "heat" and a specimen about one foot long is taken from one of the bars and subjected to a test, and if this proves satisfactory, the entire heat or bundle is accepted. (Record, Pages 174, 175; 163.) The evidence does not show that the material of which the stay bolts in the exploded boiler were made, ever was actually tested, or that any stay bolt material actually tested was in fact used in this boiler. (Record, Page 176.) Four or five bolts were made from each bar, or sixty to seventy-five bolts from a bundle or heat. (Record, Page 163.) Thus, if one defective or improperly tested heat was used in the building of the boiler which exploded, the result was that the boiler contained from sixty to seventy-five bad bolts.

Certain inspections were claimed to have been made of the boiler and water glass before the engine was delivered for the trip, but as this evidence is only to the effect that no defects *were discovered*, and by no means *compels* the inference that the boiler and water glass were *in fact* free from defects, and as all inferences from defendant's evidence, *save necessary ones*, are waived on the demurrer to the evidence, it is not considered necessary to notice this evidence in detail, because the Federal Boiler Act imposed the absolute duty upon the defendant to actually have the boiler and water glass in safe condition, and this duty is not discharged by mere proof of proper inspection. Furthermore, the only inspection claimed to have been made of the boiler before delivery for the trip was by a hostler who

said he looked at the crown sheet through the fire box door when there was fire in the fire box. He declined to state that the crown sheet was not then pocketed between the bolts but said that he did not know whether it was pocketed or not (Record, Page 239), and defendant's witness, Richardson admitted he could not tell by this method of inspection whether the crown sheet had been previously burned or not. (Record, Page 295.) As to the water glass, one hostler said he examined it when the engine came in the morning before the accident and found it then "open." (Record, Page 229.) Another hostler said he "tried" the water glass and gauge cocks and they were o. k. (Record, Page 236.) There was no evidence that any inspection was made which would determine whether the openings were *partially* closed with scale.

BRIEF OF THE ARGUMENT.

I.

The question of the sufficiency of the evidence to support recovery under the Federal Boiler Act and the Federal Employers' Liability Act presents a Federal question of law which this Court may review on writ of error, and as the trial court and State Appellate Court did not agree upon the answer to said question, the plaintiff in error is entitled to the independent consideration and conclusion of this Court, and unless the testimony is such that no recovery can be had upon the facts shown, in any view which can be properly taken of them, the plaintiff in error is entitled to have judgment entered upon the verdict of the jury in her favor.

Chicago R. I. & P. Ry. Co. vs. Devine, 239 U. S. 52.
Seaboard A. L. Ry. Co. vs. Padgett, 236 U. S. 668.
Myers vs. Pittsburgh Coal Co., 233 U. S. 184.
Coe vs. Armour Fertilizer Works, 237 U. S. 413.
Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co. vs. McCabe, 213 U. S. 207.
Louisiana Navigation Co. vs. Oyster Commission, 226 U. S. 99.

II.

The Federal Safe Boiler Act (36 Stat. 913) imposes upon the railroad company the absolute duty to have its locomotives equipped with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto, at all times while moving interstate traffic.

St. Louis I. M. & S. R. Co. vs. Taylor, 210 U. S. 281.
Chicago B. & Q. R. Co. vs. United States, 220 U. S. 559.
Delk vs. St. Louis & S. F. R. Co., 220 U. S. 580.
Texas & P. R. Co. vs. Rigsby, 241 U. S. 33.
Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.
Minneapolis & St. Louis R. Co. vs. Gotchall, 244 U. S. 66.
Illinois C. R. Co. vs. Williams, 242 U. S. 462.
Great Northern R. Co. vs. Otos, 239 U. S. 349.
Mason vs. Fearson, 9 How. 248; 13 L. Ed. 125.
Logan vs. United States, 144 U. S. 263.
United States vs. Mooney, 116 U. S. 104.
Kepner vs. United States, 195 U. S. 100.

III.

The defendant in error demurred to the evidence, and, therefore, the sufficiency of the evidence to support the verdict of the jury in favor of the plaintiff in error is to be tested by the following rule, applicable under the Virginia practice:—

> "The demurrant admits the truth of the demurree's evidence, and all just inferences that a jury might properly draw therefrom, and waives all of its own evidence in conflict with that of the demurree, and all inferences from its own evidence, *although not in conflict with the demurree's evidence,* which do not *necessarily* result therefrom."

White vs. American Nat'l Life Ins. Co., 115 Va. at Page 307.

IV.

The evidence as to the circumstances under which the explosion of the locomotive boiler occurred, justified a finding by the jury that the death of plaintiff's intestate was caused, at least in part, by either an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass; because the said evidence showed that the boiler exploded when the water glass indicated that there was a large quantity of water in the boiler, that the injector had been continuously supplying water to the boiler, and that if the boiler and water glass had been safe there could not have been an explosion under these circumstances.

(a) The fireman, Jerry Walton, observed the water glass as the train was passing Singer Tank, and the water then registered half an inch from the top of the water glass. (Record, Pages 47, 48.)

(b) When the water properly registers one inch from the top of the water glass, the boiler contains 1,296 gallons of water above the point on the crown sheet where the water stood when the overheating of said crown sheet actually occurred, and if the said water glass registered properly, it would have been necessary for the engine to vaporize or consume said 1,296 gallons between the time of leaving Singer Tank and the time of the explosion, in order for said overheating to have occurred at the time of the explosion. (Record, Page 376.)

(c) The distance from Singer Tank to the place where the explosion occurred was two and a half miles (Record, Page 253) and the train was traveling between these two places at the rate of from eighteen to twenty miles per hour. (Record, Page 58.) Therefore, the time which elapsed in traveling between two said places was from seven and one-half to eight and one-third minutes.

(d) The engine would not ordinarily vaporize or consume more water than one hundred gallons per minute. (Record, Page 378.) The engine never consumes more water than one injector will supply (Record, Pages 45, 54, 264, 277,

290, 377), and the *maximum* capacity of the injector to supply water to the boiler is 116⅔ gallons per minute. (Record, Page 377.) Therefore, the engine *could not* have consumed up to the time of the explosion more than from 870 to 967 gallons of the 1,296 gallons which the boiler contained above the crown sheet at Singer Tank, and under ordinary conditions would not have consumed more than 800 gallons. Furthermore, the accident occurred eighteen miles west of Roanoke (Record, Page 43) and the quantity of water ordinarily consumed by this class engine in traveling from Roanoke to the place of the accident is 6,000 gallons (Record, Page 292) or an average per mile consumption of 333⅓ gallons, or an average consumption between Singer Tank and the place of the accident of 833⅓ gallons. This statement as to the per mile consumption of water by this engine was made by defendant's witness Houston, and agreed with the per minute estimate given by its witness Slayton, above referred to.

(c) Furthermore, the fireman had had eighteen months experience as fireman (Record, Page 45), had previously fired on other engines of the same class and kind as that on which the explosion occurred (Record Page 54), and was able to tell easily from the sound, whether the injector was working properly and forcing water into the boiler, because it then made a solid, rising sound, whereas, when the injector failed to work properly it made a hissing or blowing sound as of escaping steam, and these distinctive sounds made by the injector were easily audible to one occupying the fireman's position in the cab. (Record, Pages 46, 48, 62, 71, 72, 75, 243, 431.) The fireman paid attention to the injector and it was working properly and forcing water into the boiler from the time the train left Roanoke until the time of the explosion. He noticed especially that it was working properly and forcing water into the boiler when he threw coal in at Singer Tank and also when he threw in coal a moment or so before the explosion. (Record, Pages 45, 46, 48, 49.) Therefore, if the

water glass registered correctly at Singer Tank, then, in order for the crown sheet to have become overheated at the time of the explosion, it would have been necessary for the engine to consume not only the 1,296 gallons of water which the water glass showed that the boiler contained above the injured crown sheet level at Singer Tank, but also the additional water which the injector was, at the same time, busily engaged in forcing into the boiler.

(f) If the boiler had been in proper condition and safe to operate, the stay bolts which broke and let the crown sheet blow down should have withstood above twelve times the strain they were subjected to by the maximum boiler pressure. (Record, Page 345.) Therefore, if the said bolts broke when there was water in the boiler, they were necessarily unsafe and not in proper condition, whereas, if they broke because of the absence of water, the water glass, which indicated that water was there, was not in proper condition.

(g) The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia was mistaken in saying in its opinion that this was the first trip the fireman, Walton, had ever made on an engine of this class on which the explosion occurred. The said fireman testified that he had previously fired on other engines of the same class and kind. (Record, Page 54.)

(h) The said Court of Appeals was mistaken in saying that on November 11th, 1912, the boiler was inspected by *Government inspectors*. As a matter of fact, the inspection referred to was claimed to have been made by one of defendant's employees, Funk, who had never served his boiler-maker apprenticeship and said he did not claim to be an expert. (Record, Pages 220, 222.)

(j) The said Court of Appeals was mistaken in saying that there would necessarily have been evidence of leakage during the run, after leaving Roanoke, and before the explosion occurred, if the crown sheet had been previously overheated. The testimony of both plaintiff's and defendant's witnesses show that quite a number of engines are

in service on nearly all railroads, the crown sheets of which have been previously overheated, the leaks having been taken out by caulking or some other method. (Record, Pages 144, 145, 421, 422, 457, 497.)

(k) The said Court of Appeals was mistaken in saying that it was in evidence that if the injector was not kept working after the engine left Singer Tank, the boiler would have vaporized sufficient water to expose the crown sheet before the explosion occured. (*Vide* a, b, c, d, *supra.*) The only testimony which the defendant contended should be so construed was that of C. L. Richardson, who said he had tried another engine over the same road bed and with the water glass one inch from the top at Singer Tank, had shut off his injector, and after running a distance of about *two and one-half miles* had again turned on the injector; that in traveling this distance of two and a half miles, the level in the glass had dropped to "one gauge;" that he did not know, except from what had been told him, where the accident happened, but thought that the place where he turned his injector back on was about one mile east of the place where the accident occured, (though defendant's witness Scott, on Page 253 of the Record, testified that the accident occurred only two and a half miles west of Singer Tank, the same distance Richardson traveled); that he did not allow the water to get extremely low, and did not know how far it was necessary to go below the bottom gauge cock, as from there down was the largest part of the boiler. There was no evidence whatever as to what quantity of water remained in the boiler above the crown sheet at the time Richardson turned on the injector, or how long it would have taken to consume same. (Record, Pages 276, 282, 285.)

(l) Evidence that the boiler and water glass had been inspected before the beginning of the trip, and no defect discovered is not conclusive evidence that said appliances were in fact in safe and proper condition, where the circumstances under which the accident happened show that they were not safe and in proper condition.

Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.
Grand Trunk W. R. Co. vs. Lindsay, 233 U. S. 42.

V.

If the evidence as to the circumstances under which the explosion occurred warranted the jury in finding that the death of plaintiff's intestate was caused wholly or in part by either an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass, this is all that is necessary to entitle plaintiff to recover under the Federal Safe Boiler Statute.

(a) The duty to have the boiler and water glass in safe and proper condition is absolute and it is no defense that defendant exercised proper care in its inspection (*Vide* II, *supra*), and contributory negligence and assumption of risk are abolished as defenses.

Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.
Grand Trunk W. R. Co. vs. Lindsay, 233 U. S. 42.

(b) The boiler was wrecked by the explosion and it is not necessary for the plaintiff to furnish an explanation of the specific cause of the explosion, but it is sufficient if the evidence raises "a reasonable inference that there was some defect" in the boiler or water glass.

Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.
Minneapolis & St. L. R. Co. vs. Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66.
Myers vs. Pittsburgh Coal Co., 233 U. S. 184.
Souden vs. Fore River Shipbld'g Co., (Mass.), 112 N. E. 82.

VI.

The evidence as to the circumstances attending the explosion, coupled with the testimony of plaintiff's expert witnesses as to inferences to be drawn from the wrecked crown sheet and bolt heads (which were in evidence), justified the jury in finding that the explosion was caused by

an unsafe boiler and that said unsafeness existed when the engine was delivered to the plaintiff's intestate at the beginning of the trip.

The evidence referred to under IV, *supra*, shows that the explosion occurred when the water glass indicated that there was an ample supply of water in the boiler. Two mechanical engineers examined the crown sheet and twelve broken bolt heads and testified that, in their opinion, the explosion was not caused by low water for the following reasons:—

(a) Because if the sheet had been heated sufficiently hot to cause a failure of sound bolts from overheating, said sheet would have been rough and red, whereas, it was, in fact, smooth and of a blue color. (Record, Pages 88, 89, 90, 113, 114, 115.)

(b) Certain bolts situated at the highest part of the crown sheet, and which would have been the first exposed by low water, did not break when the explosion occurred, whereas, others lower down on the crown sheet did break. (Record, Pages 119, 120, 121.)

(c) A line of demarkation in color on the broken surface of one-fourth of the bolt heads produced by defendant, indicated that said bolt heads had been broken on two separate occasions, first when hot, and secondly, when at boiler temperature or "cold." (Record, Pages 136, 137.)

(d) The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia was mistaken in saying that the opinion expressed by plaintiff's expert witnesses was not based on facts within their knowledge or established by other evidence in the case. The crown sheet and bolt heads were introduced in evidence and examined by said witnesses. (Record, Pages 84, 107, 113, 135, 136.)

VII.

The evidence as to the circumstances attending the explosion, taken in connection with the testimony of *de-*

fendant's expert witnesses that the inferences to be drawn from the exploded crown sheet and broken bolt heads showed that the explosion was caused by low water, justified the jury in finding that the explosion was caused, at least in part, by an unsafe water glass and that said unsafeness existed when the engine was delivered to plaintiff's intestate at the beginning of the trip.

(a) The evidence referred to under IV, *supra*, shows that the explosion occurred when the water glass indicated that there was an ample supply of water in the boiler.

(b) Defendant's expert witnesses testified that in their opinion the appearance of the crown sheet and bolt heads indicated that the explosion occurred from an absence of water over the crown sheet at the time of the explosion. (Record, Pages 300, 337.)

(c) The fireman testified that when the engine left Roanoke at the beginning of the trip, the water glass registered a little over half full; that the right injector was then turned on and kept properly working at all times thereafter up to the instant of the explosion; and that the water continued to rise gradually in the water glass until Singer Tank was reached, a few minutes before the explosion. (Record, Pages 45, 46, 48, 49, 55, 57.) If the water actually in the boiler was diminishing in quantity instead of increasing as indicated by the water glass, this could have been due only to the fact that the injector was not working *at full capacity*, and it follows that the water glass was registering erroneously at the outset, else it would, from the first, have indicated a warning of the gradual *fall* of the water level instead of a gradual *rise*.

Furthermore, if the openings leading from the water glass into the boiler had been clean and free from deposit at the beginning of the trip, they could not have become stopped up by the quantity of scale which was deposited after leaving Roanoke. (Record, Pages 118, 119.)

VIII.

The fact that it was the engineer's duty to inspect his engine, if this was his duty, and run same does not relieve the railroad company from liability for his death if it resulted wholly or in part from a defective boiler or defective water glass.

This proposition is demonstrated by the following considerations:

(a) The only inspection he was required to make of the boiler and crown sheet was to look inside the fire box before beginning the trip, and when there was a fire in said fire box, and it could not be determined from this method of inspection whether or not the crown sheet had been previously overheated or pocketed between the bolts. (Record, Pages 239, 295, 481, 482.) The plaintiff's intestate was seen to make this inspection just before leaving Roanoke. (Record, Page 252.)

(b) The only examination he had the opportunity to make of the water glass was in the time allowed for inspecting the entire engine before the beginning of the trip and at the end of the trip, and at a time when the boiler was under steam. All he could do was to turn the faucet and see if an opening leading from the water glass into the boiler were *then* open, that is, blow out the water glass. This could not possibly determine whether a quantity of scale was then deposited around the surface of the openings so that slight additional deposits would close them entirely. In other words, it is obvious that he could only ascertain that both openings were not *completely* closed, and could not determine that they were not *partially* closed, or that one of them was not completely closed. A hostler claims to have "tried" the water glass before leaving Roanoke and stated that it was then open. (Record, Page 236.)

(c) It was likewise the duty of other employees to inspect the water glass and boiler or crown sheet and if the defect was discovered by inspection, the failure to discover

same was attributable to their negligence also, and therefore, was not caused by the sole negligence of plaintiff's intestate. (Record, Pages 326, 327.) The most that could be said of his failure to discover same would be that he was guilty of contributory negligence, but contributory negligence is abolished as a defense in an action under the Federal Boiler Statute.

Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.

(d) There was no evidence that by the method of inspection the plaintiff's intestate was required to make he should have discovered the defective condition which caused the explosion, and the fact that the defect was not, in any event, discoverable by inspection, does not relieve the defendant from liability for the death of plaintiff's intestate resulting therefrom, because the defendant was under absolute duty to have the boiler and water glass in safe and proper condition. (*Vide II supra.*)

(e) The law raises a presumption that the plaintiff's intestate discharged the duties imposed upon him and used ordinary care for his safety and protection, and there is no evidence to the contrary.

W. & G. R. R. Co. vs. Gladmon, 15 Wal. 401.
Texas & Pac. R. Co. vs. Gentry, 163 U. S. 353.

(f) The plaintiff's intestate was paying attention to his duties at Singer Tank a few moments before the explosion and told the fireman Walton that they were making a nice run and would not take on water there. (Record, Page 46.)

ARGUMENT.

I.

A Federal Question Presented.

That the question of the sufficiency of the evidence to support recovery in an action under the *Federal Employers'*

Liability Act and *Safety Appliance Acts* is a question of law, involving the construction of the Acts, reviewable by this Court on writ of error, is now so well settled that it is sufficient to merely call the Court's attention to the cases cited under the first head of the Brief of the Argument.

It is likewise well settled that unless both State Courts, Trial and Appellate, agree upon the solution of said question, this Court will review the matter, *de novo*, as was done in *Myers vs. Pittsburg Coal Company, 233 U. S. 184*, the reverse of the practice followed in *Great Northern R. Co. vs. Knapp, 240 U. S. 464*, where it was said that when both State Courts have agreed upon a question of this character, their conclusions will not be disturbed unless plain and palpable error appears.

In the case at bar, the Circuit Court, which heard all the evidence and saw the wrecked crown sheet, entered judgment upon the verdict of the jury in favor of the plaintiff, but this judgment the State Appellate Court, being of opinion that the evidence was not sufficient, reversed and ordered a new trial. The evidence at the second trial being the same, the Circuit Court was bound by the rule of the law of the case to enter a final judgment thereon for defendant. The opinion of the Circuit Court gives this reason for its action. (Record, Page 604.)

II.

The Construction of the Federal Boiler Act.

The nature and extent of the duty which the defendant owed to the plaintiff's intestate, A. W. Andrews, depends upon the construction of the Federal Safe Boiler Act. (36 Stat. 913.) The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, reversing the decision and judgment of the Circuit Court in this case, held that the plaintiff could not recover because she had failed to prove *negligence* on the part of the defendant, and that no recovery could be had under said Act except upon proof of *negligence*. (See opinion, Record,

Pages 578-583.) It is respectfully submitted that in thus construing this Act said Court was in error, and that the proper construction thereof is contained in the following statement:—

The Federal Safe Boiler Act (36 Stat. 913) imposes upon the Railroad Company the absolute duty to have its locomotives equipped with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto, at all times, while moving interstate traffic.

This statute is entitled "*An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto.*"

Section 2 of the Act (*U. S. Comp. Stat. Sec. 8631*), provides as follows:—

"*From and after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and eleven, it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, its officers or agents, subject to this Act, to use any locomotive engine propelled by steam power in moving interstate or foreign traffic unless the boiler of said locomotive and appurtenances thereof are in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which the same is put, that the same may be employed in the active service of such carrier in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life or limb* * * *.*"

A comparison of the language used in the above title and section with the title and Act of March 2d, 1893, c 196; U. S. Compiled statutes Secs. 8605, 8606, 8608;—commonly known as the Safety Appliance Acts of 1893,—shows that, *mutatis mutandis*, they are the same. It is quite obvious that the author of the Safe Boiler Act had before him the Automatic Coupler Act, or one of those similar thereto, and that by striking out words inappropriate to boilers and substituting appropriate ones, he framed Section 2 of the Act in question.

The original Safety Appliance Act of March 2d, 1893, c. 196, dealt with locomotive power wheel brakes and train brakes; with automatic couplers; with grab irons and hand holds; and with the standard height of drawbars—on all cars *while used in moving interstate traffic.* By the Act of March 2d, 1903, c. 796, the provisions of the above Act were extended so as to apply to all cars and locomotives used on any railroad engaged in interstate commerce. (*U. S. Comp. Stat. Sec. 8613.*) By the Act of April 14th, 1910, the above-mentioned Safety Appliance Acts were supplemented so as to make it unlawful after July 1st, 1911, for any railroad engaged in interstate commerce *to haul on its line* any cars not equipped with secure sill steps, efficient hand brakes, secure ladders and running boards, and secure hand holds and grab irons at the tops of the ladders. (*U. S. Comp. Stat. Sec. 8618.*) By the Act of May 30th, 1908, c. 225, it was made unlawful for any common carrier to use in moving interstate traffic any locomotive not equipped with a certain kind of ash pan. (*U. S. Comp. Stat. Sec. 8624.*) It thus appears that in February, 1911, Congress had enacted safety appliance statutes covering nearly the entire field of railroad equipment except locomotive boilers and their appurtenances and that on February 17th, 1911, the Act here declared on was passed, making it unlawful for the railroad to use a steam locomotive *in moving interstate traffic* unless the boiler and appurtenances are safe.

In construing the earlier Safety Appliance Acts some of the Courts considered that the exercise of due diligence on the part of the railroad to provide and maintain the required instrumentalities was a sufficient compliance, while others held that the duty imposed was an absolute one. These differences of opinion were settled once and for all on May 18th, 1908, when this Court handed down its decision in the Taylor case (210 U. S. 281), holding that the drawbar act imposed an absolute duty on the railroads to have and maintain at all times such appliances as complied with the required standard, and that ignorance of the

defect, or the exercise of the highest degree of care and inspection on the part of the railroad was no defense. In C. B. & Q. R. Co. *vs.* U. S., 220 U. S. 559, the railroads sought to distinguish between the drawbar requirement and the section governing automatic couplers, but this Court reiterated the principles announced in the Taylor case, and said they had been regarded properly by the Courts in general as applicable in the construction of the Automatic Coupler Act. The spirit and purpose of these acts were expressed in the following emphatic language in the last-named case:

> *"If the railroad does, in point of fact, use cars which do not comply with the standard it violates the plain prohibitions of the law, and there arises from that violation the liability to make compensation to one who is injured by it."* * * * * *
>
> *"It is quite conceivable that Congress, contemplating the inevitable hardship of such injuries and hoping to diminish the economic loss to the community resulting from them, should deem it wise to impose their burdens upon those who could measurably control their causes, instead of upon those who are, in the main, helpless in that regard. Such a policy would be intelligible and, to say the least, not so unreasonable as to require us to doubt that it was intended, and to seek some unnatural interpretation of common words. We see no error in this part of the case."*

Referring to the omission of Congress to make knowledge and diligence on the part of the carrier ingredients of the act condemned, it was further said:

> *"Its omission was intentional, in order that this statute might induce such a high degree of care and diligence on the part of the railway company as to necessitate a change in the manner of inspecting appliances, and to protect the lives and safety of its employees, provided the accident occurs from a defective appliance such as is designated in this act."*

It is needless to touch upon the numerous cases decided since the Taylor case in which the principles there enunciated have been repeatedly applied by this and other courts in actions founded upon violation of the coupler act and the drawbar act. The first case, however, which this Court decided applying the same principles to the 1910 amendment relating to the duty to provide secure *hand holds* or *grab irons* was *Texas & Pacific R. Co. vs. Rigsby, 241 U. S. 33.* The railroad seems to have set up the same contention there, *i. e.*, that the plaintiff must prove that the defect in the ladder was due to the railroad's negligence, but this Court said:

> "*The question whether the defective condition of the ladder was due to defendant's negligence is immaterial, since the statute imposes an absolute and unqualified duty to maintain the appliance in secure condition.*"
>
> Citing the Taylor case, among others, as controlling the construction of the hand hold act.

And likewise in the case of *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497,* which was based upon an alleged violation of duty to maintain *safe air brakes,* this Court said:

> "*It is insisted that there was no evidence that the provision of the safety appliance act respecting train brakes was violated. It is, of course, settled that if the equipment was in fact defective, or out of repair, the question whether this was attributable to the company's negligence is immaterial.*"

And the same cases are cited as controlling the construction of the air brake act.

In *Baltimore & O. R. Co. vs. Wilson, 242 U. S. 295,* the railroad was held liable for injuries sustained by an employee where the evidence justified the finding of the jury that the violation of the *Hours of Service Act* (*34 Stat. 1415, 1416*) contributed to the injury, and the question whether

the retention of said employee in service for an excessive time was due to the Company's negligence did not even enter into the consideration of the case.

Three years after the opinion in the Taylor case had been handed down and after those principles of construction of the safety appliance statutes had become well settled and grounded into the law of the land, Congress with full knowledge of those decisions, deliberately employed the same language, *mutatis mutandis*, in the Safe Boiler Act.

The Virginia Court of Appeals distinguished the *Boiler Statute* from the other *Safety Appliance Acts*, not because of any difference in the language employed, but because of what the Court considered such a marked difference in the appliances dealt with by the acts that "rules which would be reasonable and appropriate in respect to the one class would be impossible of practical application to the other." The difference indicated, of which judicial cognizance was taken, is that couplers, drawbars, and the like are said not to require attention to keep them in safe condition, whereas the locomotive "calls for the continuous exercise of a high degree of skill and experience and the constant supervision and attention of the engineer." The "difference" is said to *exist*, but the opinion does not give the reason why the necessity to use care and skill in operating should absolve the railroad from the duty to provide a safe boiler and appurtenances.

With the utmost deference for the learned Judge who wrote the opinion, nevertheless, it seems to us that the distinction suggested was one which it was wholly within the province of Congress to consider and is not a question for the Courts. As said by Mr. Justice Moody in the Taylor case, *supra*, the "harshness" of laws "is no concern of the Courts. They have no responsibility for the justice or wisdom of legislation, and no duty except to enforce the law *as it is written*, unless it is clearly beyond the constitutional power of the lawmaking body."

The above distinction made in these statutes by the Court of Appeals appears to us to have resulted from a slight misconception of the construction this Court had placed upon the drawbar act and coupler act in the Taylor case and in C. B. & Q. R. Co. *vs.* United States, *supra*. The Court of Appeals evidently considered that under the two above cases, the railroad had been held to be not only responsible for the safe condition of the drawbar and coupler, but an *insurer of the safety of the employee*. That this is the ground of distinction advanced is indicated by the following language of the opinion of the Court of Appeals:—

> "*When, therefore, the carrier has discharged his statutory duty to the engineer by* **turning over to him** *a locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate,* **it is not answerable to the engineer as insurer of HIS safety throughout the run,** *and in order for his personal representative to maintain an action for his death caused by the explosion of the boiler, the burden rests upon the plaintiff to show that the defendant has been guilty of the* **negligence** *charged in the declaration.*"

The distinction made on account of the difference in character between boiler and water glasses on the one hand and air brakes and automatic couplers on the other applies with much logic to the measure of proof necessary to establish an unsafe condition in the respective appliances, but clearly cannot require the Court to say that a law cannot be passed imposing the duty to provide a safe boiler appliance. True, it is more difficult to prove that exploded locomotive boilers or their appurtenances were unsafe before the explosion than to prove that a hand hold which broke was insecure or a coupler which failed to couple was not in proper condition. *The mere fact of the breaking of the hold* or *the failure of the coupler to couple automatically upon impact, or the parting of the coupler in transit, or the failure of the air brakes to work properly,* have been held by this Court

to be sufficient evidence to establish a violation of the Safety Appliance Acts concerning those appliances.

Texas & Pac. R. Co. vs. Rigsby, 241 U. S. 33.
Chicago, R. I. & P. R. Co. vs. Brown, 229 U. S. 317.
San Antonio & A. P. R. Co. vs. Wagner, 241 U. S. 476.
Atlantic City R. Co. vs. Parker, 242 U. S. 56.
Minneapolis & St. L. R. Co. vs. Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66.
Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497.

But the fact that the boiler requires attention by the engineer to prevent its exploding is a good and sufficient reason why evidence of the mere fact that it did explode while in his charge should not be sufficient, in and of itself, to prove that the statute has been violated, for, in the absence of evidence as to the circumstances attending the explosion, it may be perhaps as probable that the accident occurred through his lack of attention as that it occurred from an unsafe appliance. Therefore, in an action based upon a violation of this Act, it may be said with a great deal of force that the evidence must go further than in the acts above mentioned and must justify an inference that the explosion was not caused solely by the fault of the engineer but resulted, at least in part, from the unsafe appliance.

But the fact that a locomotive requires the engineer's constant attention is no reason why if he is actually injured or killed because of an unsafe boiler or appurtenance, he or his family should not be compensated, as far as there can be compensation. The same principles of natural justice and public policy apply alike to the engineer as to another injured by a defective coupler. The difficulty in *proving violation* of the duty is no reason why the duty itself should not exist.

A few months before the *Safe Boiler Act* was passed the Senate Judiciary Committee submitted its report on the amendments of 1910 to the *Employers' Liability Act* and the

following purpose of enactments of this nature was stated in the following language:

> *"It was the intention of Congress in the enactment of this law originally, and it may be presumed to be the intention of the present Congress, to shift the burden of the loss, resulting from these casualties from 'those least able to bear it', and place it upon those who can, as said by the Supreme Court in the Taylor case, 'measurably control their causes.'*
>
> *"The passage of the original act and the perfection thereof by the amendments herein proposed, stand forth as a declaration of public policy to radically change as far as congressional power can extend those rules of common law which the President in a recent speech at Chicago characterized as 'unjust.' President Taft in his address at Chicago, September 16th, 1909, referred 'to the continuance of unjust rules of law exempting employers from liability for accidents to laborers'."*

The Committee also quoted with strong approval from President Roosevelt's message to the Sixtieth Congress:

> *"The practice of putting the entire burden of loss of life or limb upon the victim or the victim's family is a form of social injustice in which the United States stands in unenviable prominence. In both our Federal and our State legislation we have, with few exceptions, scarcely gone farther than the repeal of the fellow servant principle of the old law of liability, and in some of our states even this slight modification of a completely outgrown principle has not yet been secured. The legislation of the rest of the world stands out in striking contrast to our backwardness in this respect. Since 1895 practically every country in Europe, together with Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, British Columbia, and the Cape of Good Hope has enacted legislation embodying in one form or another the complete recognition of the principle which* **places upon the employer the entire trade risk in the various lines of industry."**

In *Binns vs. United States, 194 U. S. 486,* the reports of congressional committees were held to be appropriate sources of information for determining the scope of statutes passed on the strength of them.

The Federal Employers' Liability Act refers expressly to "statutes enacted for the safety of employees," is *in pari materia* with them, and the same spirit must be considered to pervade them all.

This Court referred to the spirit and purpose of the hand hold act in *I. C. R. Co. vs. Williams, 242 U. S. 462,* and said:—

> *"This highly important and humane purpose must not be defeated by finesse of construction such as is pressed upon our attention in the argument of this case."*

The purpose of the *Safety Appliance Acts* has been stated by this Court to be two fold; first, to avoid accidents by stimulating an extraordinarily high degree of care and diligence on the part of the railroads in respect to furnishing and inspecting appliances; and, second, where the accident has actually happened, to transfer the burden of the often overwhelming loss from the shoulders of the injured man or his family to the railroad which is so much more able to bear it; *C. B. & Q. R. Co. vs. United States, 220 U. S. 559.* The purpose is both just and humane. An accident frequently blots out at once the entire support of the laborer and his family, and aside from the loss of life or limb, results in almost inconceivable privation and hardship. The primary purpose is to prevent the occurrence of such catastrophies, the secondary one is to alleviate the suffering if such primary purpose fails.

Experience has shown that these purposes can be accomplished in no other way than by imposing upon the carrier the absolute responsibility for losses suffered from defective machinery—not upon the theory that the carrier has done a conscious wrong, but rather upon the prin-

ciple that the business itself should bear the losses occurring from these causes in the prosecution of that business. Nothing is now better recognized than that the rule requiring the carrier to respond in compensation for only such losses as occurr by reason of its culpability has proven wholly inadequate to meet modern industrial conditions. This is true for many reasons, not one of the least of which is the frequent impossibility of *proving* the carrier's want of diligence. The evidence is largely in the possession of the railroad and long before the injured man has recovered from his hurt or the bereaved family from the shock of its overwhelming loss, experience has shown that the evidence, if any, which might have been at first available is beyond their reach. And when the issue involves a question of whether proper care has been exercised and expert testimony becomes important, it can hardly be said to be an equal contest between the employee and the great facilities of the railroad. From these and numerous other practical difficulties impartial students of the subject are at one in the view that the only rule which can effect a just result is that imposing an absolute duty respecting the safety of appliances which, if defective, would probably cause injury. With this purpose in mind, the Safety Appliance Acts of 1893 were enacted, and having proven effective, have been added to and enlarged as we have heretofore mentioned.

In no other kind of railroad service is there greater difficulty of proving the lack of care respecting the condition of machinery than where a locomotive boiler has exploded. Here the very happening of the accident wipes out the evidence of negligence and enriches the field for expert testimony, based upon the appearance of the wrecked machinery. The automatic coupler, the hand hold, and such appliances may be examined after an accident and their condition ascertained, but after the explosion of a boiler conditions found merely furnish grounds for inference as to the previous condition. The occult nature of the boiler and appurtenances therefore, and the difficulty of obtaining evidence

which would establish the want of care respecting their condition, demonstrate a greater need for legislation imposing the absolute duty to maintain them in safe and proper condition than existed with respect to the appliances covered by the other acts.

But if Section 2 of the *Boiler Act* is not to be construed according to the same principles as the other acts respecting other appliances, what construction can reasonably be given this Statute? The Court of Appeals does not define its conception of the nature of the duty imposed. Are knowledge and lack of diligence to be considered essentials to its violation? In *C. B. & Q. R. Co. vs. United States, supra*, it was said that Congress purposely omitted to make knowledge and diligence ingredients of the act condemned by the *Automatic Coupler Statute*, so as to impose an absolute duty to provide and maintain the appliance in proper condition at all times with the object in mind of necessitating a change in the manner of inspecting appliances. The same omission having been repeated here, three years after the fact of its omission had been finally construed as imposing an absolute duty and as shifting the burden of loss due to the defective appliance from the injured employee, or his family, to the business in which it occurs, *a fortiori*, ought to be given the same effect.

On the other hand, if the injured employee be required to establish that a specific defect existed in the boiler or appurtenances before the beginning of the journey, as our opponents contend, the statute makes no change in the law. The only method by which this previous defect can be shown is by the testimony of some employee who knew of it beforehand; but proof of such previous condition and such knowledge by the employee would have supported a common law action.

The only effective rule that can be applied is that which this Court has already so repeatedly laid down, holding the railroad responsible for all injuries *caused by these defective appliances*, for the plaintiff, in the very nature

of things, cannot show *when* the defect came into existence. And so it has been repeatedly held with reference to violations of the other safety appliance acts that the railroad is liable for personal injuries sustained by an employee within their protection although the defect occurred in transit after the equipment was delivered to the train crew. In *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497*, the railroad was held liable solely upon the evidence that the air brakes failed to work properly at the time of the accident, though, as the opinion says:—

> "*It appeared without dispute that it (the equipment) consisted of the Westinghouse standard automatic air brake, such as is in general use throughout the country upon passenger trains. A witness in defendant's employ testified that shortly before Campbell took the train out from Coeur d' Alene on the trip in question he inspected the air brakes and found them in perfect order.*"

In *Grand Trunk W. R. Co. vs. Lindsay, 233 U. S. 42*, the plaintiff's right to recover for violation of the automatic coupler act was upheld in spite of the following language of the opinion:—

> "There was evidence tending to show that the coupler had been inspected shortly before the accident and no defect was discovered by the inspector."

though it was unquestionably out of order *at the time of the accident* on account of a bent pin.

And in *Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company vs. Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 598*, recovery was upheld solely upon proof that the coupler between two cars parted while the train was in motion, resulting in the automatic setting of the emergency brakes and the death of a brakeman, who, having been standing on top of one of the cars, was thrown under the wheels by the sudden jerk.

As a matter of practice, it is impossible to prove *when* a defect in one of the appliances which has caused an injury *first came into existence*, and, therefore, no other rule than that applied in the foregoing cases will accomplish the purpose for which the statute was passed. The language of the Act is that unless the boiler and appurtenances *are safe*, it shall be unlawful to use same *in moving interstate traffic*, making it a clear violation of its provisions to use same after the defect comes into existence, whether the defect occurs while *in transit* or existed beforehand. And as to the other safety appliance acts, even after the discovery of the defect, if the car is hauled to the repair shop, while no penalty can be incurred for so doing, nevertheless it is at the carrier's risk *as to accidents to employees. 36 Stat. at Large 299. Great Northern R. Co. vs. Otos, 239 U. S. 349.*

That the Act here under consideration was intended to change the common law duty with respect to providing and maintaining safe locomotive boilers and appurtenances is further evidenced by the fact that in the Act of March 4th, 1915, c. 169, Section 1, Congress provided that,

> *"Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto,' approved February 17th, 1911, shall apply to and include the entire locomotive and tender and all parts and appurtenances thereof."*

This language could have been intended to have no other effect than to impose with respect to the safeness of the entire locomotive and tender and all its parts and appurtenances the same absolute duty as that imposed by other acts concerning automatic couplers, drawbars, grab irons, hand holds, ladders, ash pans, and the other appliances dealt with by similar language in the other acts. It was clearly intended to afford to a locomotive engineer whose injury or death may be caused in part by some defect in the loco-

motive, the same protection and redress afforded other employees by the other Safety Appliance Acts.

To sum up on this point,—from the omission of Congress to make knowledge and diligence ingredients of the Act condemned, and from the fact that the language of the Boiler Act is so similar to the other Safety Appliance Acts which have been construed to impose an absolute duty at all times, it seems clear that the same construction must be applied *unless the nature of the boiler and appurtenances is such as would render the Boiler Act unconstitutional if so construed.* But the nature of the appliances, in fact, not only does not prohibit such a construction, but in order to accomplish the general purpose of these statutes, indicates a greater need for it than under the other acts. However, the locomotive, being in charge of the engineer and requiring attention from him to prevent an explosion even when in proper condition, *evidence of the mere fact of an explosion while in charge of the engineer, would seem not to be sufficient* to prove a violation of the duty imposed by the statute for his protection, but the evidence must show that the explosion occurred under such circumstances as that it would not have occurred if the boiler and appurtenances had been safe.

Finally, in view of this Court's previous construction of the similar acts, it is submitted that the rule stated in *Mason vs. Fearson, 9 How. 248, 13 L. Ed. 125,* precludes any other construction for the Boiler Act than that we contend for:

> *"With knowledge of our construction, like words being again repeated by Congress, it may well be considered that a like construction was intended and was expected to be given these words."*
>
> *Logan vs. United States, 144 U. S. 236.*
> *United States vs. Mooney, 116 U. S. 104.*
> *Kepner vs. United States, 195 U. S. 100.*

III.

The Rule Applicable for Determining the Sufficiency of the Evidence.

The rule by which the evidence is to be viewed in order to determine the question of its sufficiency to sustain the verdict of the jury upon a demurrer to the evidence under the Virginia practice, is substantially the same as that prevailing in the Federal courts upon a motion to direct a verdict. The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia has repeatedly stated the rule in this language:

> *"The demurrant admits the truth of the demurree's evidence, and all just inferences that a jury might properly draw therefrom, and waives all of its own evidence in conflict with that of demurree, and all inference from its own evidence, although not in conflict with the demurree's evidence, which do not necessarily result therefrom."*
>
> *White vs. Am. Nat. L. Ins. Co., 115 Va., at P. 307.*

The admission is, therefore, that the jury has drawn every inference in favor of the demurree, and against the demurrant, and has given full credence to all of demurree's witnesses.

Thus, the question is whether, construing all the evidence in the most favorable aspect possible to the demurree, or plaintiff in error, there is enough to sustain the verdict in her favor.

IV.

The Circumstances Under Which the Boiler Exploded Permit an Inference or Finding That it Was Caused Either by an Unsafe Boiler or an Unsafe Water Glass.

It is not disputed that if the boiler exploded when the crown sheet was covered with water, the boiler was unsafe

when the explosion occurred. On the other hand, it is quite obvious that if the explosion occurred because of an absence of water from the crown sheet and at a time when the water glass indicated that there was a sufficient quantity of water in the boiler to cover the crown sheet, then the water glass was not in proper condition. The only question involved under this proposition, therefore, is whether the evidence warranted the jury in finding that the explosion occurred when the water glass indicated that the boiler contained an abundance of water over the crown sheet.

The fireman, Jerry Walton, was the only surviving eyewitness of the explosion. He stated repeatedly that he looked at the water glass just after throwing in some coal as the train was passing Singer Tank, and the water glass registered a half inch from the top. This fact is undisputed. Singer Tank, according to defendant's evidence, is two and a half miles east of where the explosion occurred.

Defendant's witness, Slayton, admitted on cross-examination that when the water stood *one inch* from the top of the water glass the boiler contained 1,296 gallons of water above the point on the crown sheet where the water stood when the crown sheet was overheated, said point being three inches below the top of the crown sheet. The next question, therefore, is whether this 1,296 gallons of water could have been consumed by evaporation in the time required to run the two and one-half miles from Singer Tank to the place where the explosion occurred. The train was running at the rate of eighteen to twenty miles per hour, according to the testimony of fireman Walton, so the time required to run this distance was from seven and one-half to eight and one-third minutes.

According to the testimony of every witness in the case, the engine in question would not consume water at a greater rate than one injector could supply it. There was no dissenting voice as to this fact. It was also shown that the *maximum* capacity of the injector was 116⅔ gal-

lons per minute. If we were to concede that the engine was using as much water as the injector could possibly supply, it still follows that the engine could not have consumed more than from 870 to 967 gallons of the 1,296 gallons which was in the boiler, above the crown sheets burned area, at Singer Tank. But the defendant's Superintendent of Motive Power, Slayton, admitted that this engine would not ordinarily consume more than 100 gallons of water *per minute*. This witness was also forced to admit that the engine could not have used up enough water to expose the crown sheet in the time required to run the two and one-half miles, if the water glass correctly registered an inch from the top at Singer Tank. (Record, Pages 376, 379.)

The average *per mile* consumption of water by this engine between Roanoke and the place of the accident, was shown to be 333⅓ gallons, which would be 833⅓ gallons between Singer Tank and the place where the explosion occurred.

Furthermore, in addition to the fact established as above shown, that the water glass indicated that the boiler contained such a quantity of water at Singer Tank, that it could not have been vaporized so as to permit the crown sheet to become exposed at the time of the explosion, the evidence also shows that the *injector was supplying additional water all the time that the engine was traveling from Singer Tank to the place of the explosion.*

The defendant seeks to escape from the conclusion necessarily following from the above state of facts, by raising the following contention: That the effect, or probative value of the evidence above outlined, as to the quantity of water in the boiler at Singer Tank, the distance from there to the place of the explosion, the speed of the train, and the rate of consumption of water per minute and per mile by the engine which exploded, is completely overcome by an experiment claimed to have been by one

of its engineers, C. L. Richardson, with another engine. Richardson testified to the following facts:

That he ran his engine, No. 479, along the road bed between Singer Tank and the place of the accident, drawing a train of about the same weight as that on which the explosion occurred; that his water glass registered a half an inch to an inch from the top at Singer Tank; that he was making between eighteen and twenty miles per hour; that as an experiment he shut off his injector at Singer Tank to see how fast the water would drop in the glass; that after running two or two and a half miles, the water dropped to one gauge, which he had been told by boilermakers indicated that the boiler contained three inches of water over the crown sheet; that he did not let the water get extremely low or anything like that; that he did not know how much more water the engine would have had to consume to expose the crown sheet, because the water which remained was in the largest part of the boiler, as the boiler tapers smaller at the top; that the place where he again turned on his injector was about a mile east of where *he had been told* the accident happened, and where he had seen indications of cinders and things. (Record, Pages 276, 282, 285.)

The evidence is that when the crown sheet became overheated the water level was three inches *below* the top of the crown sheet, as shown by the marks on the sheet. When Richardson turned on the injector after running two and one-half miles, the water level was at least three inches *above* the top of the crown sheet. Therefore, the boiler of Richardson's engine contained six inches more water in the largest part of the boiler after running two and one-half miles from Singer Tank with the injector shut off, than the Andrews engine contained when it was overheated. Though defendant was in exclusive possession of the drawings and blue prints which would have disclosed how many more gallons of water the engine would have had to consume to reduce the water level to where it stood when the overheating occurred, it did not offer any evidence

upon this point. The presumption is that if this evidence had been favorable it would have been offered. The question, therefore, as to how much longer this quantity of water would have lasted is left to conjecture.

Furthermore, it will be noticed that the witness says he ran two and one-half miles before turning on the injector; but two and one-half miles is the distance from Singer Tank to the place of the explosion; and as the witness said he did not know where the explosion occurred except from what he had been told, and from the fact that he had seen some cinders about a mile west of where he turned on the injector, it appears not improbable that he turned his injector on about the place of the explosion; the best that could be said for his testimony is that his estimates of distance are wholly inaccurate, and, therefore, his testimony is very uncertain.

Construed favorably to the plaintiff in error, as must be done, we do not see how this evidence can shake, in the slightest degree, the probative value of the evidence as to the quantity of water indicated by the water glass to have been in the boiler at Singer Tank, as to the time consumed in traveling the two and one-half miles from there to the place of the explosion, and as to the per minute and per mile consumption of water by the engine which exploded.

But the defendant in error is confronted with the further difficulty that even if the quantity of water indicated by the water glass to have been in the boiler at Singer Tank could have been consumed by the engine in traveling the two and one-half miles to the place of the explosion, so as to expose the crown sheet, *still the evidence shows that the injector was in the meantime supplying the boiler with additional water.*

The defendant in error seeks to avoid the effect of this evidence, by saying that the fireman, who testified to said fact, was so ignorant as to the injector that he could not

tell whether it was working properly or not, and that his evidence cannot be given credence and is of no weight.

But in this contention the defendant is clearly in error.

The evidence is sufficient to warrant the jury in finding that the injector was properly working and forcing water into the boiler in traveling between Singer Tank and the place where the explosion occurred.

The fireman, Walton, testified that the engineer, Andrews, turned on the right injector when the train left Roanoke, and that it remained on until the explosion occurred; that if the injector is working properly and forcing the water into the boiler it makes a solid sound, while if not putting water into the boiler it makes a steam noise. That he noticed especially when he was firing the engine at Singer Tank and when firing a few seconds before the explosion, that it was making the solid sound. (Record, Pages 45, 46, 47, 48.) He stated further that he could tell from the sound of the water going through the pipe whether the injector was working or not, and that it is an easy matter to tell. (Record, Page 46.)

The defendant's witness, Neece, a hostler, stated that one can always tell whether the injector is working by the sound; that when working it gives forth a ringing sound, while if it is not working, it makes "*a blowing sound, it don't have any sound at all, you can hear it blowing.*" (Record, Page 243.)

The Interstate Commerce inspector, Pfahler, defendant's witness, said that an engineer can sit in his cab and tell instantly if the injector of the type in question fails to work properly, and that it makes no difference whether it is dark or not. (Record, Page 431.)

F. A. Richardson, an engineer of many years experience, and who was in defendant's employ at the time he was testifying, said that a fireman had no trouble in telling from the difference in sound whether or not the injector is throwing water into the boiler; that this is the first

thing a fireman learns. (Record, Pages 71, 72.) He stated again, on cross-examination, that a fireman can tell, *by listening*, whether the injector is properly throwing water into the boiler, but that a man who was not familiar with that type of injector and engine could not tell "*right at first*," but he would have to have *some* familiarity with the engine and injector; that the sound is easily audible in the cab, and this would not be affected by the cab window being closed, because the sound comes up from between the engine and tender. (Record, Page 75.)

The said witness, Walton, who was fireman at the time of the explosion, and testified that he knew from the sound the injector made that it was kept constantly working properly after leaving Roanoke, had had quite considerable experience as fireman, having held that position for eighteen months prior to the accident. While he was not very familiar with the type of engine which exploded, yet he said he had previously fired for other engineers on engines of the same class and kind. (Record, Page 54.) He said he would not be positive (it had been about two years since he had been on the engine), but thought the injector and pipes were situated inside the engine cab *because he could hear the injector working.* When asked as to the location of the pipes with respect to the cab, he said "it runs on the inside, *I suppose; you can hear it.*"

Defendant's contention is that because the witness was not very familiar with the type of engine which exploded, and could not remember two years later the details of construction of the engine, and the location of the injector and pipes leading from the injector to the boiler, that therefore the Court should say as a matter of law, that his testimony that he heard the injector make the characteristic sound of a working injector, is not sufficient proof of what he testifies to. This contention loses sight of the fact established by three other witnesses (two of them defendant's), that the fireman while in the cab could easily hear the injector, and that the sounds given forth when working and not working,

respectively, were as described by Walton. The point is, *Could he hear it working?* If he could, it is immaterial that he did not remember two years later that the injector on the engine which exploded did not occupy the same position as that on the old type upon which he had previously fired. One may very easily remember that two years ago he heard a clock strike a certain hour when a particular event was transpiring, and still not be able to recall the slightest memory of where the clock sat, or whether it was in the room with him or in an adjoining room or hall. His credibility would obviously depend upon whether he was within hearing distance of the clock, not upon whether he could recall where it was located.

Walton's statement that he was within hearing of the injector and could tell by the sound whether it was working, and also his statement as to the manner of distinguishing between the respective sounds when working and not working, having been corroborated by three other reliable witnesses, it seems clear that his testimony on this subject should be taken to establish the fact that while the train was traveling between Singer Tank and the place of the accident, the right injector was working properly and forcing water into the boiler.

The testimony of the fireman as to the registration of the water glass at Singer Tank, the continuous working of the injector, and the speed of the train between Singer Tank and the place of the accident, the undisputed evidence as to the quantity of water in the boiler above the overheated part of the crown sheet, and as to the distance from Singer Tank to the place of the accident, and as to the per minute and per mile consumption of water by the engine, raise an undisputable inference that the explosion resulted either from an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass.

This inference the defendant contends is overcome by its evidence as to certain alleged inspections of the boiler and water glass, but this contention is clearly untenable.

Evidence that the boiler and water glass had been properly inspected before the beginning of the trip, and no defect discovered, is not conclusive evidence that said appliances were in fact in safe and proper condition, where the circumstances under which the explosion occurred show that either said boiler or said water glass was not in proper condition.

The defendant introduced evidence as to certain tests given the material of which the stay bolts were constructed, while the engine was being built, which was in substance as follows:

The witness, B. O. Yearwood, testified that he witnessed the tests of the stay bolt material, which were conducted at the Baldwin Locomotive Works, before the boiler was built. That that material when in the rolling mill, before arriving at the locomotive works, was in the form of a square billet of iron. From this billet about sixteen to twenty bars, approximately sixteen feet in length, were rolled and placed in a bundle, with a serial number stamped on them for identification. This bundle was termed a "heat" and the only test which was conducted was to select a specimen piece, about one foot in length, from one of the bars, and ascertain the tensile strength of this particular foot. If the result was satisfactory, the entire bundle was accepted. The witness admitted that he had no personal knowledge that all the bars in the same bundle were rolled from the same billet, but the rolling mill was relied on to adhere to the customary practice in this respect.

The witness, J. C. Shinn, was the employee of the Baldwin Locomotive Works in connection with the same tests. His testimony was substantially the same as that of Yearwood. He admitted that the material used in the test represented less than one per cent. of that which was used for the stay bolts in building the boiler; that he did not know what per cent. test was generally required by other railroads; that he was only twenty-one years of age, and that he began testing material only a few months before the time these tests were conducted. It was further ad-

mitted by the witness that he did not know what became of the material after he tested it; that he had no personal knowledge whatsoever that it was actually used in the boiler in question.

With reference to these tests, it is obvious that no *necessary* inference follows from them that all the material used in making the stay bolts was of the specified strength. If by any mischance the test was reported as made when it was not, or if the workman was careless in his work—for it is human to err—or if the foot of iron used in the test chanced not to be a true and correct representative of the other three hundred feet of the supposed heat, or if the material thus tested was not actually used in the boiler, any one of which things might easily have happened, and still the testimony be true, the bolts in a large part of the boiler would probably be far below the strength required in the specifications. While the evidence may have indicated that the defendant used reasonable care in this respect, it is by no means conclusive that the iron was of the quality specified.

The witness, Bowden, defendant's employee, testified that he supervised the building of the ten locomotives of which 469 was one, and so far as he could tell, the work was well done. He actually saw a very small part of it while it was being done. After the boiler was completed, it was subjected to a water pressure of 285 pounds to the square inch, or 4,560 pounds to the bolt (about one-tenth of the holding power designated in the specifications) and also to a steam test of 220 or 240 pounds. Neither of these tests were much in excess of the ordinary boiler pressure.

The next witness, John Schaefer, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, described the water test, which he said he conducted and preserved written memoranda of, and said that 267 pounds to the square inch was the pressure used, instead of 285, as indicated by Bowden; and James Reed, who conducted the steam test, said only 220 pounds was

the pressure used for that test. These tests only subjected the stay bolt material to a strain of about 4,000 pounds, and may be said to show that when the engine was built it was able to withstand that pressure.

The witnesses also stated that after the boiler was completed, it was "cooked" out with soda so as to remove all accumulations off the crown sheet. The only pertinent fact that the defendant can claim is to be *necessarily* inferred from the foregoing testimony, is that the stay bolts were able to withstand a strain of 4,272 pounds at the time the engine was built. (16x267 4,272.) So much for the tests applied while the engine was being built.

Next, as to the inspections conducted after the engine was put into service. It was shown that the Government regulations require the bolts to be inspected by the "hammer test" once a month. This consists in striking the bolt head with a hammer and judging from the sound and resiliency whether it is broken or not. The Company required the engineer to look into the fire box door before and at the end of each run to try to discover leaks, and the hostlers to make a similar examination between trips. Slayton testified that the boilermakers were required to go into the fire box between trips when the fire was out, and inspect. The only inspections actually shown to have been made of the engine after it was built were the following:

(1) The defendant's employee, Funk, who did not claim to be an expert, and had not served his boilermaker apprenticeship, made the monthly hammer inspection required by the government regulations on November 11th, four days before the explosion. He says he found everything in good condition; that there were no pockets in the crown sheet at that time, but that he did not look inside the boiler. The bolts were not subjected to any test at that time to determine their holding power, and the utmost that can be said to be established by the inspection, if full credence be given the witness, is that, so far as he could tell, none of the stay bolts were broken at that time, and

the crown sheet had not been pocketed between the bolts as it was after the explosion. He also said the water glass was in proper condition at that time.

(2) The hostler, Whitesell, testified that he took charge of the engine when Andrews brought it in on the morning of the 14th of November, the morning preceding the night of the explosion, and that so far as he could see there were no pockets in the crown sheet, and it was all right. He stated that the fire was kept in the engine all day, and did not claim that such an inspection as he made would have resulted in the discovery of the pockets in the crown sheet. He further testified, on cross-examination, that he had charge of handling some seven or eight engines that day, all of which had fire in them, but that he did not try to keep watch on them, as he didn't attend to the fire and water; that this was Monk Vaughn's duty, he being the fire and water man; that the witness had nothing to do with the fire and water, and did not watch that at all; and that he would not positively say that the water did not get low while he was away from it; that the water has to be renewed in the engines standing in the roundhouse five or six times a day; that the steam pressure is kept low, about 120 to 140 pounds, in the roundhouse. He said further that he examined the water glass and found it "open." As to what kind of examination he made of the water glass, his testimony is silent. There is no evidence that he cleaned out the openings, or that they were free from deposits. When the witness was testifying, it had been two years since the accident, and he admitted finally that he did not remember what happened this day any more than any other day, and that his testimony was given upon the assumption that he did the same thing every day.

As to this witness' testimony, viewed under the demurrer, it seems to have little, if any, probative value. His testimony shows that he did not remember whether he examined the crown sheet or water glass of engine 469, or whether he even handled the engine at all on the day in

question. Certainly, no inference can be drawn from it that the crown sheet was not then pocketed, or that the water glass was clean and free from deposits.

(3) The hostler, Neece, testified that he came on duty at eight o'clock on the night of the accident. That he inspected the crown sheet by looking inside the fire box door when there was a fire in the engine; that he put some oil on a rag and made a torch which he used to enable him to see the crown sheet up in the forward end over the brick arch, and the crown sheet was not leaking at that time; that it was not his duty to make such an inspection, but—to quote the witness—"we had had so much trouble with fellows claiming we had burned engines around there, that was the reason I done that." He did not claim, however, that the slight pockets between the bolts in the crown sheet could be seen by this method of inspection, even when aided by a torch. These questions and answers are found in his testimony on Page 239 of the Record:

> "*Q. Then by the aid of that light, was that light enough for you to see that crown sheet?*
>
> "*A. Yes, sir.*
>
> "*Q. And notwithstanding the fact that you could see the crown sheet, you refuse to state that there were no buckles in it; that is true, isn't it?*
>
> "*A. Yes, sir.*"

He also said he "tried" the water glass and it was "o. k." From the shifting manner of this witness, it is very doubtful if he ever did what he claims. The Superintendent of Motive Power said it was not his duty to do it, and if he did do it, it was wholly voluntary. (Record, Page 481.) But conceding that he did, the inference is not even permissible, much the less necessary, that the crown sheet had not been overheated previous to his inspection. The utmost that can be inferred is that it was not then leaking, and this the plaintiff does not dispute. Defendant's witness, C. L. Richard-

son, admitted that the slight pockets found in the crown sheet after the explosion would not be revealed by such an examination as Neece and Whitesell claim to have made, and his testimony on this point is not disputed. As to the water glass, clearly his statement that he "tried" it is not conclusive that it was then clean and free from deposits.

(4) The only other inspections that defendant claims the crown sheet received were those made by the plaintiff's intestate himself. These inspections, if they can be so called, consisted merely in looking inside the fire box with a fire in the engine. Leaks in the crown bolts might be discovered in this way, though not when the engine was hot, unless leaking very badly. The buckles or pockets in the crown sheet between the bolts cannot be discovered by this method of inspection. The engineer was required to thus look into the engine before and after every trip, and at the end of every trip make a written report as to the condition of his engine. The decedent completed three trips on this engine after the monthly inspection, which was made on November 11th, and, therefore, he made three written reports to the defendant as to the engine's condition. The two reports which were made on November 13th and November 14th, respectively, were introduced in evidence by the defendant, *but it is significant that it did not produce the one made at Roanoke on the morning of November 12th.* (Record, Page 251.) The evidence further shows that this engine made a trip from Princeton to Roanoke on November 9th, *on which Massie was the engineer*, and that the engine lost four hours and fifty minutes in a ten-hour run trying to get up steam. (Record, Pages 257, 259.) The trip made by Andrews from Princeton to Roanoke on the night of the 11th, just after Funk had completed his inspection, was necessarily the next trip the engine made after Massie had his trouble. The other two reports were regarded as sufficiently important to bring the witness, W. R Moore, from Princeton, West Virginia, to Christiansburg, Virginia, for no other purpose than to prove by him the

identity of the report made on the 13th by the decedent, and the witness, Pharr, from Roanoke, to identify that of the 14th, *yet not a word is said about what condition he reported the engine in on arriving at Roanoke the morning of November 12th.* The witness, Scott, testified that he saw the decedent look into the fire box door at his crown sheet before beginning the run on the night of the accident, showing that he performed the duty required of him.

The testimony of the defendant, viewed on the demurrer, even conceding the credibility of the witnesses, cannot be said to prove more than the following:

(1) That the stay bolts of the boiler when built were able to withstand a strain of at least 4,272 pounds, when the engine was first built.

(2) That the crown sheet had not been pocketed on November 11th, 1912, when inspected by Funk.

The foregoing, then, constitutes the evidence as to the "inspections" upon which the defendant in error relies to overcome the unavoidable inference arising from the circumstances under which the explosion occurred. What, then, is the legal effect of this evidence as to inspections and what weight has been accorded such evidence by this Court in actions under the Safety Appliance Statutes?

The case of *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497*, seems conclusive upon this point. The plaintiff, Campbell, was the motorman in charge of a special train running between Spokane and Coeur d'Alene. Having, in violation of his orders, run by the point where he should have met Train No. 20, and while running about thirty miles an hour, he saw Train No. 20 about 800 feet away, approaching from the opposite direction, and realized that a head on collision was imminent. He immediately shut off the power and threw on the emergency air brake to the full capacity. The brakes took hold properly and held for thirty-five or forty feet, when the air released or "leaked off" and after that there was nothing he could successfully do to stop the train. From these circumstances, the jury found "that

the air brakes on Campbell's train *immediately before the collision* were insufficient to enable him to control the speed of the train." The defendant contended, however, that the evidence as to inspections which had been made of the air brakes a very short time theretofore, showed that they were not defective, and that this evidence should be held to overcome the inferences arising from the evidence as to the circumstances showing that the brakes would not work properly. Upon this subject the Court said:

> "*It is insisted that there was no evidence that the provision of the Safety Appliance Act respecting train brakes was violated. It is, of course, settled, that if the equipment was in fact defective or out of repair, the question whether this was attributable to the company's negligence is immaterial. (Citing cases.) Hence the argument is that, according to all of the evidence, the equipment was not defective or out of repair. It appeared without dispute that it consisted of the Westinghouse standard automatic air brake, such as in general use throughout the country upon passenger trains. A witness in defendant's employ testified that shortly before Campbell took the train out from Coeur d'Alene on the trip in question he inspected the air brakes and found them in perfect order. But there was much evidence besides that of Campbell himself, to the effect that when he applied the emergency the brakes took hold and then leaked off so as to release the brakes. The jury was warranted in finding from the testimony as a whole that Campbell properly applied the air when 600 feet or more from the place where the collision occurred and that the brakes refused to work. Expert witnesses called by defendant, testified in effect that the train could have been stopped inside of 300 feet if the brakes had been in proper order.* **The air brake equipment was wrecked in the collision, so that there was no explanation of the cause of its failure to operate properly; but it was a reasonable inference that there was some defect or want of repair in the valve or packing."**

Grand Trunk W. R. Co. vs. Lindsay, 233 U. S. 42, was an action to recover for injuries sustained by one of a switching crew in endeavoring, by going in between the cars, to effect a coupling where the cars failed to couple automatically upon impact. The defendant relied upon previous inspections to establish the fact that the coupler was not defective, but this Court affirmed a judgment in favor of the employee upon evidence as to the condition of the coupler at the time of the accident. It was said in the opinion:

> *"There was evidence tending to show that the coupler had been inspected shortly before the accident and no defect was observed by the inspector, but it was shown without dispute that it was defective at the time of the accident, and would not couple because of a bent pin."*

It seems clear from the two above decisions that evidence as to inspections is probative only of the fact that *no defect was discovered*, and where controverted by other evidence, or by inferences from the circumstances under which the accident happens, is not sufficient to compel the finding that the appliance was, in fact, in proper condition.

V.

IF THE EVIDENCE AS TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH THE EXPLOSION OCCURRED WARRANTED THE JURY IN FINDING THAT THE DEATH OF PLAINTIFF'S INTESTATE WAS CAUSED WHOLLY OR IN PART BY EITHER AN UNSAFE BOILER OR AN UNSAFE WATER GLASS, THAT IS ALL THAT IS NECESSARY TO ENTITLE PLAINTIFF TO RECOVER UNDER THE FEDERAL SAFE BOILER ACT, THE RULE OF RES IPSA LOQUITUR BEING APPLICABLE.

In *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497,* Mr. Justice Pitney, speaking for the Court, used this language:—

"Upon the whole case, we have no difficulty in sustaining his right of action under the Employers' Liability Act. That Act (81, 35 Stat. at L, 65, Chap. 149, Comp. Stat. 1913, Sec. 8657) imposes a liability for injury to an employee resulting **in whole or in part** *from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency due to its negligence in its cars, engines, appliances * * * * or other equipment. As was held in San Antonio & A. Pass. R. Co. vs. Wagner, 241 U. S. 476, a violation of the Safety Appliance Act is "negligence" within the meaning of the liability act. And by the proviso to Sec. 3 of the latter act, no employee injured or killed shall be held to have been guilty of contributory negligence in any case where a violation of the Safety Appliance Act* **'contributed** *to the injury or death of such employee.' It is too plain for argument that under this legislation the violation of the Safety Appliance Act need not be the* **sole efficient cause,** *in order that an action may lie. The Circuit Court of Appeals held that the element of proximate cause is eliminated where concurring acts of the employer and employee contribute to the injury or death of the employee. We agree with this, except that we find it unnecessary to say the effect of the statute is wholly to eliminate the question of proximate cause. But where, as in this case, plaintiff's contributory negligence and defendant's violation of a provision of the Safety Appliance Act are concurring proximate causes, it is plain that the Employers' Liability Act requires the former to be disregarded."*

In the case at bar the boiler was wrecked by the violence of the explosion and conditions found afterwards, judging from the conflicting views entertained by the expert witnesses, cannot afford an entirely satisfactory explanation of the cause of the explosion. The circumstances under which the explosion occurred, therefore, must necessarily be the most reliable evidence as to its cause. These circumstances point conclusively to the fact that it was due either to an unsafe water glass or an unsafe boiler, for either of which the defendant is responsible. It is true the plaintiff cannot lay

finger upon the precise cause. In the nature of things this must be impossible, and the law does not require the impossible, but only the highest degree of proof of which the case is susceptible, or that can reasonably be made. The general rule applicable is thus stated in *Shearman and Redfield on Negligence* (Sixth Edition), Pages 127, 130:—

> "*The plaintiff is not bound to prove more than enough to raise a fair presumption of negligence on the part of the defendant and of resulting injury to himself. Having done this, he is entitled to recover, unless the defendant produces evidence sufficient to rebut this presumption. It has sometimes been held not sufficient for the plaintiff to establish a probability of the defendant's fault; but this is going too far. If the facts proved make it probable that the defendant violated his duty, it is for the jury to decide whether he did so or not. To hold otherwise would be to deny the value of circumstantial evidence. As already stated the plaintiff is not bound to prove his case beyond a reasonable doubt, and, although the facts shown must be more consistent with the negligence of the defendant than with the absence of it,* **they need not be inconsistent with any other hypothesis."**

In *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497*, the Court spoke as follows upon the question whether the evidence justified a finding that the air brake was defective:

> "*The air brake equipment was wrecked in the collision, so that there was no explanation of the cause of its failure to operate properly;* but it was a reasonable inference that there was some defect or want of repair in the valves or packing."

In *Minneapolis & St. L. R. Co. vs. Gotschall, 244 U. S. 66*, the action was to recover for the death of a brakeman while engaged in interstate commerce. The following quotation from the opinion shows the evidence upon which the right to recover was upheld.

> "*The evidence tended to show the following facts: Gotschall, a minor, twenty years old, at the time in*

question was head brakeman on an extra freight train running from Albert Lea, Minnesota, to Minneapolis, and transporting interstate commerce merchandise. As the train left Jordan, an intermediate station, Gotschall boarded a car toward the rear end and was proceeding along the tops of the cars toward the locomotive when the train separated because of the opening of a coupler on one of the cars, resulting in an automatic setting of the emergency brakes and a sudden jerk, which threw Gotschall off the train and under the wheels.

The jury, under an instruction of the Court, was permitted to infer negligence on the part of the Company from the fact that the coupler failed to perform its function, there being no other proof of negligence. It is insisted that this was error, since, as there was no other evidence of negligence on the part of the Company, the instruction of the Court was erroneous, as, from whatever point of view looked at, it was but an application of the principle designated as **res ipsa loquitur,** *a doctrine the unsoundness of which, it is said, plainly results from the decisions in Patton vs. Texas & P. R. Co., 179 U. S. 658, 45 L. Ed. 361; 21 Sup. Ct. Rep. 275, and Looney vs. Metropolitan R. Co., 200 U. S. 480, 59 L. Ed. 564, 26 Sup. Ct. Rep. 303, 19 Am. Neg. Rep. 627. We think the contention is without merit because, conceding in the fullest measure the correctness of the ruling announced in the cases relied upon to the effect that negligence may not be inferred from the mere happening of an accident except under the most exceptional circumstances,* **we are of opinion such principle is here not controlling in view of the positive duty imposed by the statute upon the railroad to furnish safe appliances for the coupling of cars."**

The case of *Myers vs. Pittsburgh Coal Company, 233 U. S. 184*, is also authority for the fact that where the case is one of circumstantial evidence, the plaintiff is not required to point out the specific cause of the accident.

Plaintiff's intestate in that case was employed to keep his position on the rear end of the rear car of a train operated in the underground galleries of a mine; the cars were drawn

by a motor which disconnected from the train, ran forward upon a switch which closed to let the train pass, and when the train had passed, the motor followed up the cars. The power was supplied to the motor by means of an overhead wire charged with a current of electricity sufficient for that purpose, which was five feet seven inches above the surface of the ground upon which the tracks were laid. The deceased signalled with his cap, which was equipped with a light; otherwise the passage in which the cars ran was dark. The motor was not equipped with a headlight and when it followed behind the train it had just been hauling, it ran upon the body of the deceased who was alive at the time he was taken from the spot at which the motor ran upon him. His cap, with the lamp upright and burning was found on the floor of the gallery by the side of the track near where the body lay. When last seen alive, a few moments before, the deceased was occupying his position at the rear end of the train making signals to control the movement of the train. There was no eye-witness to the circumstances which caused his death and no other explanation of the cause thereof than may be inferred from the above statement of facts. From this statement of facts, the plaintiff deduced that decedent came in contact with the trolley wire and by means of such contact received an electric shock which disabled him but did not kill him, and that while in that disabled condition he was run upon by the motor; and that defendant was guilty of negligence in placing the wire at such a low elevation from the ground or the cars that the decedent and others similarly employed might come in contact with it and thereby sustain injury. The Trial Court permitted the case to go to the jury and the jury found a verdict for the plaintiff upon which judgment was entered and the defendant sued out a writ of error to the Circuit Court of Appeals, 3d Circuit. That court reversed the judgment upon the ground that the evidence supported other theories as to the cause of decedent's death upon which defendant would not be liable

of equal probability with the theory upon which the Trial Court had held the defendant liable. A writ of *certiorari* was allowed by this Court and this Court reversed the judgment of the Court of Appeals and affirmed the judgment of the Trial Court. This Court said:

> *"The opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals placed the reversal largely upon the want of definite proof as to the manner in which Myers came to his death, whether by contact with the wires, or, if so, whether that merely disabled him or he was only injured or stunned by the fall, was seized with vertigo or other sudden sickness and fell from the car for that reason, or lost his footing by some unexpected movement of the train, or voluntarily got off the car and stumbled and fell upon the track, or became bewildered in the dark, and mistakenly supposed himself to be in a place of safety. The Court held that all of these situations were more or less probable, and in the absence of some more accurate means of ascertaining the true condition in this regard, no recovery could be had for wrongful causing of his death, and that an examination of the testimony brought the Court to the conclusion that the jury should not have been permitted to guess as to the proximate cause of death. This question, however, was submitted to the jury and found against the defendant in the Trial Court.* **Unless the testimony was such that no recovery can be had upon the facts shown in any view which can be properly taken of them,** *the verdict and judgment of the District Court must be affirmed."*
>
> *"That there was ample testimony to carry the question of negligence to the jury we have already said, and in any case, it cannot be said as a matter of law that there was no evidence tending to show that Myers came to his death by negligence of the defendant in one or more of the ways charged in the petition. Considering the testimony, as it must be considered in determining questions of this character in Appellate Courts, in its most favorable aspect ot the plaintiff below, we think the jury might well have found, in view of the place at which the body of Myers was found near to the wire, with his cap gone from his*

head, that he came in contact with that wire and was thrown to the ground and that he survived from the contact with the wire, carrying the voltage which it did, and while in this situation, was run over and killed by the approaching motor car, the operator being unable to see his body from the track because of the want of efficient light in the entry or in the motor car. We think reasonable men, considering the testimony adduced, might well have come to this conclusion, and that it was error in the Appellate Court to set aside the verdict for entire absence of testimony upon this subject. In our opinion, the Trial Court properly left the question to the jury upon testimony which, when fairly considered, might sustain the verdict." (Pages 192-3.)

It seems well established by the foregoing decisions of this Court that if an injury is sustained under circumstances indicating that said injury was caused by a defect in an appliance required by one of the Safety Appliance Acts to be in safe and proper condition, the plaintiff is not required to show what the particular defect was, but it is sufficient if the evidence, viewed in the most favorable light for the plaintiff, justifies the inference that said appliance failed to perform the function required of it.

To the same effect, in an action under the common law, is the decision in the case of Souden *vs.* Fore River Shipbuilding Co. (Mass.), 112, N. E. 82, which was an action to recover for injuries from the explosion of the boiler of a ship. The plaintiff claimed that the circumstances under which the explosion occurred indicated that it was due to one of two causes; that either the water got low because of the failure of the feed pump to properly supply the boiler, or else the fuel oil did not spray properly from the nozzle, and impinged on one point on the tube, causing overheating, bulging and rupture. The defense was made that the plaintiff must prove specifically what caused the explosion and that the state of the evidence left the matter

to conjecture. But the Court held otherwise and in its opinion, goes on to say:

> *"The fact that the explosion occurred while the boiler was subject to the use for which it was designed, is,* **of itself,** *evidence of a defective condition. Cleary vs. Cavanaugh, 219 Mass. 281, 106 N. E. 998; Sullivan vs. Reed Foundry Co., 207 Mass. 280, 93 N. E. 576; Minihan vs. Boston Elev. Ry. Co., 197 Mass. 367; 83 N. E. 871. While the plaintiff was bound to offer evidence to show that the explosion was caused by the defendant's negligence, he was not required to point out the particular act or omission which caused the accident."* (*Citing cases.*)

The foregoing authorities seem to us to clearly sustain our position upon this point, but if the Court should be of the opinion (which we trust it will not), that the evidence as to the circumstances under which this boiler exploded is not sufficient, standing alone, to support the plaintiff's verdict, then we respectfully submit that the law and evidence in this record, supports the following proposition.

VI.

THE EVIDENCE AS TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE EXPLOSION, COUPLED WITH THE TESTIMONY OF THE PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT WITNESSES AS TO INFERENCES TO BE DRAWN FROM THE APPEARANCE OF THE WRECKED CROWN SHEET AND BOLT HEADS WHICH THEY EXAMINED, SUPPORTS A FINDING BY THE JURY THAT THE EXPLOSION RESULTED FROM AN UNSAFE BOILER, AND THAT THE SAID UNSAFENESS EXISTED WHEN THE ENGINE WAS DELIVERED TO THE PLAINTIFF'S INTESTATE AT ROANOKE.

It will not be necessary to again consider in detail the evidence as to the quantity of water shown by the water glass at Singer Tank and the impossibility of its being consumed in the few minutes which elapsed thereafter before the explosion occurred. We hope we have demon-

strated that the evidence clearly establishes these facts in our discussion under point IV, *supra*. We also discussed there the question of the fireman's ability to tell whether the injector was properly working, and also the inspections which certain of defendant's employees claim to have conducted, and have called the Court's attention to the fact that said inspections, so far as the crown sheet is concerned, consisted in merely looking inside the fire box door when there was a fire in the fire box, and that defendant's employees admitted that they could not tell by such an inspection whether the crown sheet had been previously overheated or not. This, of course, does not apply to the inspection which the witness Funk claimed to have conducted on November 11th, three days before the explosion, but even if this be taken as establishing the fact testified to,—that the crown sheet had not then been overheated—it by no means negatives the possibility that it was overheated after that inspection. A number of witnesses testified that many engines are at all times in service with overheated and pocketed crown sheets. After the inspection of November 11th, the engine was in charge of plaintiff's intestate, Andrews, about half the time, while the other half of the time it was in charge of round house employees in the yards. The evidence clearly does not negative the possibility that the engine may have been overheated in the yards after November 11th, and the leaks, if any developed therefrom, secretly removed by calking at the instance of, or by, the employee through whose fault the overheating occurred. The expert evidence introduced by the plaintiff was to the effect that the crown sheet's appearance indicated that it had been overheated on some occasion prior to the explosion. While there was conflicting evidence offered by the defendants, as the case is here on demurrer to the evidence, the testimony of plaintiff's witnesses must be accepted as true. Their testimony was to the effect that the crown sheet had never been heated sufficiently hot to cause a failure of the bolts, because if it had been, the color of the sheet would have been red and the

surface would have been rough, whereas it was a steely blue and perfectly smooth. Furthermore, the mill scale, which the sheet acquired when it was rolled, was still present; whereas, if it had been heated sufficiently hot to cause sound bolts to break, this mill scale would have been destroyed. They also testified that a number of bolts in the higher part of the crown sheet which would have been first exposed by low water and longer exposed to the heat than those lower down in the sheet, had held out and had not broken, whereas others lower down in the sheet had broken. Also, one-fourth of the broken bolt heads produced by the defendant as having come out of the wreck showed that a part of the fracture occurred while the bolts were hot, and that a part of the broken surface had never been heated above the ordinary boiler temperature. That part of the surface of the broken bolts which had been heated was blue in color, like the surface of the crown sheet, while the other part was bright, indicating a cold break. If this bright part had ever been heated it would have turned blue.

For the above reasons, and from the general appearance and shape of the blown-down crown sheet, and from the fact that it was not anywhere torn, and from other minor indications, plaintiff's expert witnesses were of the opinion that the sheet was not hot when the explosion occurred, and that the explosion resulted from other causes.

This expert testimony was corroborated by the testimony of the fireman as to the registrations of the water glass indicating that the boiler exploded when it was full of water, as said fireman told defendant's witness, Scott, immediately after the explosion.

While the evidence of defendant as to inspections and examinations of the water glass would not compel the jury to find that it was in safe and proper condition, it would permit such a finding.

For these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the evidence is sufficient, upon this phase of the case, to support a finding by the jury that the crown sheet and

bolts had been overheated before the engine was delivered to the plaintiff's intestate at Roanoke, and that the boiler exploded when there was ample water present to prevent overheating, and that said boiler was then unsafe and not in proper condition.

If the Court should hold against us on this point, however, and should be of opinion that the evidence compels a finding that the explosion was caused by low water, then, we respectfully submit that the evidence sustains the plaintiff in error's right to recover upon the following proposition:

VII.

THE EVIDENCE AS TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE EXPLOSION, TAKEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE TESTIMONY OF DEFENDANT'S EXPERT WITNESSES THAT THE INFERENCES TO BE DRAWN FROM THE EXPLODED CROWN SHEET AND BROKEN BOLT HEADS SHOWED THAT THE EXPLOSION WAS DUE TO LOW WATER, SUPPORT A FINDING BY THE JURY THAT THE EXPLOSION WAS CAUSED, EITHER WHOLLY OR IN PART, BY AN UNSAFE WATER GLASS, AND THAT SAID UNSAFENESS EXISTED WHEN THE ENGINE WAS DELIVERED TO PLAINTIFF'S INTESTATE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE TRIP.

In our argument under point IV, *supra*, we have already shown that a few minutes before the explosion, while the train was passing Singer Tank, the water glass indicated that the boiler contained so great a quantity of water that it could not have been consumed sufficiently by the time of the explosion to expose the crown sheet and that the fireman could easily tell whether the injector was working properly.

The fireman, Walton, testified that when the train left Roanoke the right injector was immediately turned on, and continuously thereafter worked properly, up to the instant of the explosion. In addition, it is a self-evident proposition that the injector started to working properly, else the train

could never have run the 18 miles which it did run before the explosion occurred. When it once starts working properly, the evidence is that it will continue to so work as long as the steam pressure is kept up. (Record, Pages 267, 270, 281.) Between Singer Tank and the place of the accident the full boiler pressure was maintained. (Record Page 49.) It may be taken as clearly established, therefore, that the injector was continuously forcing water into the boiler all the time after leaving Roanoke (the initial point), up until the explosion occurred.

Upon leaving Roanoke the water glass was half full. The water gradually rose in the glass until at Singer Tank it was half an inch from the top.

If the Court be of opinion that the evidence compels a finding that the explosion occurred from low water, the only way this could have happened would have been for the injector to have been working at less than full capacity and to have been supplying, all along, *a little less water than the engine was vaporizing into steam.* Therefore, immediately after leaving Roanoke, the water level should have gradually fallen in the water glass, if the water glass had been in good condition and registering properly. But the fireman says—the water gradually *rose* in the glass. It is a reasonable and proper inference, therefore, that if the water glass registered erroneously at Singer Tank, it had likewise been erroneously registering ever since leaving Roanoke, and had been indicating a rising level when it should have been indicating a falling level.

If either the top or bottom opening leading from the water glass into the boiler becomes stopped up by deposits of lime salts scale, which is always being precipitated from the boiling water on to metallic surfaces in contact therewith, this will cause the water glass to register erroneously. (Record, Page 477.) But if these openings are in a clean condition and free from deposits, it will take many hours for sufficient deposits to accumulate to close them. The evidence was undisputed that if these openings had been

in anything like proper condition at the beginning of the trip, the deposits could not have accumulated sufficiently fast to close them at the time the explosion occurred. (Record, Pages 118, 119.)

There is no evidence that the water glass openings had been cleaned out since the inspection of November 11th, nor is there any evidence that the water glass was subjected to any inspection or examination thereafter which would determine whether these openings were free from deposits. It is obvious that while one blowing out the water glass may ascertain that the openings are not *completely* closed, he cannot tell whether they are partially closed. On November 11th, the inspector, Funk, claims that a wire was run through the openings to clean out the scale, but no one claims to have cleaned them out after that time.

The fact that the openings were not stopped up when examined by the interstate commerce inspector several days after the explosion does not require an inference that they were open when the explosion occurred. This, because, in the first place, some employee of defendant, upon whom the blame for the unsafe condition would have fallen, could easily have unstopped the openings, and, in the second place, the pressure in the water glass if only one opening is stopped up, is the same as that in the boiler, and the effect of the sudden withdrawal of the pressure inside the boiler, due to the escape of the steam into the fire box, would be to "blow-out" the water glass as effectually as it could be done by turning the faucet of the water glass and allowing steam or water to escape therefrom into the cab, which is the ordinary method of temporarily unstopping the openings.

Therefore, if the explosion was actually caused by low water, clearly the jury might well have found that the water glass was not in proper condition when the engine was delivered to the plaintiff's intestate at the beginning of the trip.

VIII.

THE FACT THAT IT WAS THE ENGINEER'S DUTY TO INSPECT HIS ENGINE AND RUN SAME, DOES NOT RELIEVE THE RAILROAD COMPANY FROM LIABILITY FOR HIS DEATH IF IT RESULTED WHOLLY OR IN PART FROM A DEFECTIVE BOILER OR DEFECTIVE WATER GLASS.

The contention of the defendant is that it can escape liability from injuries to an engineer due to a defective boiler or water glass by imposing on the engineer a general duty of inspecting the engine. This position is clearly untenable. The engineer, in the nature of things, is not a mechanic or expert inspector. The duties for which he is fitted are those appertaining to the running of his engine. This is vitally important and consumes all his time. As said by this Court in Chicago, B. & Q. R. Co. *vs.* United States, 220 U. S. 559, Congress intentionally imposed upon the railroads the absolute duty to have its appliances safe, "that this statute might induce such a high degree of care and diligence on the part of the railroad company as to necessitate a change in the manner of inspecting appliances, and to protect the lives and safety of its employees." If the company could relieve itself of responsibility for a violation of this duty by shifting it on to the employee, who is required to use the appliance *and for whose benefit and protection the duty was placed on the railroad,* it is obvious that the purpose of the statute would be entirely frustrated and the law would be but a dead letter.

But there is no evidence that there was imposed upon the engineer any specific duty with respect to the water glass, or that by any inspection he could make while the engine was in his charge, he could have ascertained the true condition of the water glass. The evidence seems to indicate that by opening the valve of the water glass he could tell whether water or steam would pass through from the boiler into the glass, but it would seem that this condition would exist even if one of the openings leading into the boiler was closed.

However this may be, it is clear that he could not tell whether the openings were clean and free from deposit. In fact, the evidence does not show exactly what he could ascertain by blowing out the glass.

As to the crown sheet, the testimony is that the only inspection he was supposed to make was to look through the fire box door up at the crown sheet. The evidence is clear that he could not have discovered by this method of inspection whether the crown sheet had been previously pocketed or overheated or not. It was shown that plaintiff's intestate did look at the crown sheet and if the defect had been discoverable by this method of inspection, the presumption is he would have discovered it.

Furthermore, it was the duty of other employees than plaintiff's intestate to inspect both the crown sheet and water glass, and if the defect was discoverable by inspection, the failure to discover and remedy same was as much the result of their negligence as it was the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate, and if the water glass or crown sheet was in an unsafe condition from a concurrence of his own negligence with that of other employees, plaintiff's right to recover is not prejudiced thereby, as contributory negligence is wholly abolished as a defense in this case.

Defendant has made the further contention that even if the water glass was defective, the plaintiff's intestate was negligent in relying thereon, and that, therefore, his death resulted solely from his own negligence.

This contention of the defense is rested upon the proposition that the engineer had two means of ascertaining the level of the water in the boiler—one by observing the water glass and the other by testing with the gauge cocks, consisting of three telltale holes or openings in the boiler head leading into the boiler, by turning the valves of which the water level may be ascertained. But the defendant's witness, Richardson, a locomotive engineer, stated that it was customary for the engineer to rely on the water glass, and that if it gets sluggish

or appears dangerous, *then* they test the gauge cocks to see if anything is out of order. (Record, Pages 274, 281.)

As this action, however, is for injuries to an employee due to violation of a statute enacted for his safety, the following quotation from the opinion of this Court in *Spokane & I. E. R. Co. vs. Campbell, 241 U. S. 497*, is equally applicable to this case. We have already quoted this excerpt, but as it is peculiarly applicable here, we will, for convenience, again do so.

> *"Upon the whole case, we have no difficulty in sustaining his right of action under the Employers' Liability Act. That Act imposes a liability for injury to an employee 'resulting* **in whole or in part** *from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence in its cars, engines, appliances * * * *or other equipment.' As was held in San Antonio & A. P. R. Co. vs. Wagner, 241 U. S. 476, a violation of the Safety Appliance Act is "negligence" within the meaning of the Liability Act. And by the proviso to Section 3 of the latter Act, no employee injured or killed shall be held to have been guilty of contributory negligence in any case where a violation of the Safety Appliance Act* **"contributed** *to the injury or death of such employee." It is too plain for argument that under this legislation the violation of the Safety Appliance Act need not be the sole efficient cause, in order that an action may lie. The Circuit Court of Appeals held that the element of proximate cause is eliminated where concurring acts of the employer and employee contribute to the injury or death of the employee. We agree with this, except that we find it unnecessary to say the effect of the statute is wholly to eliminate the question of proximate cause.* **But where, as in this case, plaintiff's contributory negligence and defendant's violation of a provision of the Safety Appliance Act are concurring proximate causes, it is plain that the Employers' Liability Act requires the former to be disregarded."**

The argument that the engineer was guilty of *contributory negligence* was apparently advanced by the defendant in the case of *Hough & Spradlin vs. Moreland's Admr.* (Ky.) *169 S. W. 467 (1914)*, where the plaintiff made the same alternate claims as here, first that the boiler exploded from unsafeness when the water was present, and, second, if it occurred from low water, as the defendants there claimed, it was the proximate result of defendants' negligence in failing to provide a water glass, though there were three gauge cocks, which defendants claimed dispensed with the necessity of a water glass. The Appellate Court upheld the action of the Lower Court in submitting the case to the jury *upon both theories*, and affirmed a judgment for the plaintiff for the death of her intestate, who was in charge of operating the boiler when it exploded, although contributory negligence would have been a complete defense in that case. Certainly if it was not *contributory* negligence as a matter of law, where there was no water glass to rely on or be misled by, it cannot be said to be the engineer's *sole* negligence when the glass was defective.

Also the case of *Southern Pacific Railway Company vs. Vaughn (Texas) 165 S. W.—; 7 N. C. C. A. 622*, brought under the Federal Employers' Liability Act, for the death of a locomotive engineer, appears to have been tried on the same alternate theories, that the explosion was due to a defective water glass, or to defective stay bolts. The defense was that the engineer negligently allowed his water to get low. It appears from the opinion that both theories were presented to the jury and judgment for plaintiff was affirmed. The evidence in that case showed that the hostler had inspected the water glass just before the engine went out, and found it in good condition, but the Court did not regard this as conclusive evidence that the glass was as the hostler thought or said he found it to be.

There is no evidence whatsoever in the record in this case that the plaintiff's intestate was guilty of any negligence. On the other hand, the evidence shows that he was

attending to his duties, and that he told the fireman a few minutes before the accident that they were making a nice run and would not stop at Singer Tank to take on water. (Record, Page 46.)

In the absence of evidence of negligence on his part, the presumption of law is that he was exercising proper care for his safety.

W. & G. R. R. Co. vs. Gladmon, 15 Wal. 401.
Texas & Pacific R. Co. vs. Gentry, 163 U. S. 353.

The defendant contends that there was no defect in the boiler or water glass, yet, in the same breath, claims that Andrews should have discovered the defect. In the absence of proof that the defect which actually caused the explosion was *discoverable* by inspection, it is difficult to understand how this contention can be maintained.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that the plaintiff in error's right to recover in this case is supported by the evidence upon each of the following theories:

1. The circumstances, *standing alone*, permit an inference by the jury that the explosion was caused by either an unsafe boiler or an unsafe water glass.

2. The circumstances, taken in connection with the testimony of *plaintiff's* expert witnesses to the effect that the crown sheet and bolt heads presented an apperance of having been overheated on some occasion *prior to the accident*, permit an inference by the jury that the explosion was caused by *unsafe stay bolts and crown sheet;* and

3. The circumstances, taken in connection with the testimony of *defendant's* expert witnesses to the effect that the crown sheet and bolt heads presented an appearance indicating that they were overheated on account of low water *at the time of the accident*, permit an inference by the jury that the explosion was caused by an *unsafe water glass.*

If the Court should be of opinion that the evidence is sufficient to sustain *any one* of these three theories as to the cause of the accident, it follows that the judgment complained of should be reversed, and it is respectfully asked that this Court so order.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. B. HUNT,
A. P. STAPLES,
Counsel.

Dated at Roanoke, Va.,
March 20th, 1918.

INDEX

	Page
Statement of case	1
Brief of the argument	7
Burden of proof	7
Rule applicable under the Virginia Practice in considering evidence on a demurrer to the evidence	10
The findings of fact by the State Courts and the effect of such findings upon this writ of error	11
The conclusions of the State Courts as to the facts and inferences resulting therefrom are not so palpably erroneous that this Court will base a reversal on that ground	15

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

	Page
Baugham *vs.* N. Y. P. & N. R. R. Co., 241 U. S. 237	14
Erie R. R. Co. *vs.* Welsh, 242 U. S. 303	15
Great Northern Ry. Co. *vs.* Knapp, 240 U. S. 464	15
N. & W. Ry. *vs.* Holmes, 109 Va. 407	11
N. & W. Ry. Co. *vs.* Warden, 117 Va. 801	11
Ryan *vs.* Falls River Iron Works Co., 200 Mass. 188, 86 N. E. 310	10
Saxe *vs.* Walworth Mfg. Co., 191 Mass. 338, 77 N. E. 883	10
S. A. L. Ry. Co. *vs.* Koennecke, 239 U. S. 352	15

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1917

No. 341.

MAUDE L. ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX,
Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

THE VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY,
Defendant in Error.

BRIEF OF COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT IN ERROR.

STATEMENT OF CASE

The statement of the case, as made by Counsel for the plaintiff in error, is controverted, because it is in many respects inaccurate, and is to some extent misleading. Certain facts are stated, as established by uncontroverted evidence, which are not established by the evidence when properly interpreted, and are directly in conflict with the findings of fact by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. Disconnected and isolated statements of witnesses are quoted as establishing certain facts, when such statements in connection with the context and whole testimony of the witness give an entirely different meaning to the statements of the witnesses.

Inasmuch as the facts of the case are stated accurately by the defendant in error in its petition, which is found on

Pages 1 to 4 of the Record, and by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, in its opinion, found on Page 578 of the Record, it is not thought necessary to make a complete detailed statement of the facts of the case.

For the purposes of this brief, however, the leading facts may be briefly stated as follows:

This action was originally brought in the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Virginia. There was a trial of the issues involved before a jury, which resulted in a verdict in favor of the plaintiff, on which the said Circuit Court entered a judgment. This judgment, on writ of error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, was reversed, and the case was remanded to the Circuit Court for a new trial, in accordance with the principles established by the Court of Appeals in its decision.

The case was then removed to the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, Virginia, and upon a trial in that Court, the evidence, as embodied in the record of the case, in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, was introduced, subject to objection by the defendant to such of said evidence as was improper under the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia.

By reference to the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, above referred to, it will be seen that a large part of the evidence of the witnesses for the plaintiff, and on which the plaintiff relies, in its brief filed herein as establishing certain facts, was improper and inadmissible.

Upon a demurrer to the evidence by the defendant and joinder therein by the plaintiff, the Circuit Court of Roanoke County entered a judgment for the defendant. From this judgment a writ of error was prosecuted to the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, which writ of error was first refused by all five of the judges of said Court individually, in vacation, and, upon being presented to the whole Court in session, was refused by the Court. This was in accordance with the Virginia Statute that when the judgment complained of is plainly right, the petition for a writ

of error, should be rejected, but the rejection of such petition by a judge in vacation shall not prevent the presentation of such petition to the Court at its next term.

The effect of these proceedings was to establish in the said Courts findings of fact which are only subject to review in a limited way by this Court.

It appears from the opinion of the Circuit Court, found on Page 604 of the Record, that the Circuit Court entered its judgment based on the findings of facts and conclusions of law as set forth n the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, found on Page 578 of the Record.

The effect of the refusal of a writ of error from that judgment by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, was a concurrence by that Court in the facts and conclusions of law so established. Whatever may have been the views of the judge of the Circuit Court on the former trial, the judgment sought to be reviewed in this Court is based upon this finding as to the facts and the law of the case on which the said Circuit Court entered the judgment under review in this Court.

The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, in its opinion above referred to, in narrative form, states an outline of the salient facts as established by the Record. In this outline, of facts, all questions in controversy were reviewed and findings of fact established. The result of this review and finding on questions of fact in controversy was the conclusion by the Court, after rejecting the improper evidence admitted, that all of the evidence, viewed from the standpoint of a demurrer to the evidence, shows that when the engine was turned over to the plaintiff's intestate the boiler and appurtenances were in proper condition and safe to operate in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life and limb.

The main facts relied upon by the plaintiff, as established by the testimony in this case, are directly in conflict with the findings of fact by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, on which the judgment sought to be reviewed in this case is based.

Under the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals the testimony of certain witnesses is rejected as improper. This is particularly true as to the testimony of the witnesses Walton and Richardson, as to the operation of the injector, and the opinion evidence of the expert witnesses for the plaintiff This rejected evidence is the foundation for the main facts on which the plaintiff bases the argument for a reversal of the judgment by this Court. This is in absolute disregard of the rule established by this Court as to the review of the rulings of Courts below on questions as to the admissibility of testimony.

The plaintiff seeks a reversal by this Court on the ground of an erroneous construction of the Federal Boiler Act by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. From an analysis of the opinion of the Court, it will appear that the ultimate ground of the decision of said Court was the findings of fact by the Court that the requirements of the Federal Boiler Act had been met and satisfied by the defendant. The only interpretation placed upon the Federal Boiler Act by said Court was, in effect, that when it affirmatively appears that an engine satisfying the requirements of the Act has been delivered to an engineer to be operated by him, and an explosion occurs which results in the death of the engineer, then in order for his representative to recover on account of alleged defects proof of such alleged defects must be furnished. In other words, as stated by the Court, when the carrier performs its statutory duty of turning over to the engineer an engine in proper condition and safe to operate, it is not answerable to the engineer as an insurer of his safety throughout the run.

There was no question before the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia as to the absolute duty of a railroad company to have its locomotives equipped with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances, and to maintain the same in that condition.

It will be seen from Pages 5 and 6 of the Record that this defendant, in its petition to said Court for a writ of

error, admitted that it was under this absolute duty in respect to the boiler and its appurtenances of its engines. It further appeals that the only question involved was as to the burden of showing the existence of the defect from which an inference arises that this absolute duty has been violated. The contention of the plaintiff was that under all circumstances an inference of a defect should result from the mere fact of an explosion. The contention of the defendant was that an inference of a defect would not result from the fact that there was an explosion unsupported by any other facts, because explosions might, and do often, result from other causes than defects in the boiler and appurtenances.

The uncontradicted evidence showed that the explosion of the boiler which resulted in the death of the plaintiff's intestate was caused by the tearing off of the heads of the stay bolts which supported the crown sheet. The crown sheet itself did not give way and after the explosion was not torn or injured in any way, except that it was bulged and forced down for a distance of about ten inches as the result of the breaking off of the heads of the stay bolts by which the crown sheet was held up and supported.

The testimony of the witnesses for the plaintiff, as well as the testimony of the witnesses for the defendant, shows that the crown sheet had been burned; that is to say, it had been heated with no water on top of it. There were a number of witnesses for the defendant, including two government experts, who examined the engine after the explosion, all of whom were shown to have had a wide experience in the inspection of crown sheets which had failed, who testified that the burning of the crown sheet and the consequent weakening of the stay bolts was the cause of the explosion. These witnesses, introduced by the defendant, were also of the opinion that the burning of the crown sheet resulted from low water in the boiler at the time of the explosion. The expert witnesses of the plaintiff who testified in the case did not advance any

definite, positive opinion as to what caused the stay bolts to break, but it is a fair inference from the testimony of their witness, Randolph, who alone attempted to express any opinion on the subject that the burning of the crown sheet was the cause of the failure of the stay bolts. He seemed to differ with the witnesses for the defendant only on the question of how long prior to the failure the burning of the crown sheet had occurred. In his opinion it might have been burned at any time between half an hour prior to the time of failure, or three or four months prior to the time of the failure, and this opinion was based alone upon the color of the crown sheet at the time of trial, which took place nearly two years after the accident.

In the opinion of Scrivenor, the only other expert witness of the plaintiff, the appearance of the crown sheet itself was not positive proof that it failed from low water and, in regard to the cause of the failure, he expressed the opinion that it might have been caused from low water, or might have been caused from other things.

In passing upon the respective contentions of the parties based upon this testimony, and particularly the contention that the negligence of the engineer should only go to mitigate damages, the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia held that the evidence tends to show that the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate was the sole cause of his death.

This conclusion of the Court necessarily involved the holding by the Court that the evidence shows that the crown sheet was burned on that trip through the negligence of the engineer in allowing the water in the boiler to become so low that the crown sheet was uncovered. That this was the conclusion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, is shown by the fact that the Court considered this view of the case controlling and rendered it unnecessary to pass on other assignments of error.

BRIEF OF THE ARGUMENT

The presentation of this case will involve a consideration of the following propositions:

(1) The burden of proof as to alleged defects under the Federal Boiler Act;

(2) The rule applicable under the Virginia practice in considering evidence on demurrer to the evidence;

(3) The findings of fact by the State Courts and the effect of such findings upon this writ of error;

(4) The conclusions of the State Courts as to the facts and inferences resulting therefrom are not so palpably erroneous that this Court upon an examination of the evidence will base a reversal of the judgment upon that ground.

These questions will be briefly discussed in the order stated above:

I.

The Burden of Proof as to Alleged Defects Under the Federal Boiler Act.

The different contentions of the parties in the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, as to the proper construction of this Act, have already been stated. The construction placed on the Act by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia the plaintiff alleges is erroneous, in that the Act imposes upon a railroad company the absolute duty to have its locomotives equipped with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto at all times while moving interstate traffic. The existence of this duty has never been denied by the defendant, and the Supreme Court of Appeals, in its opinion, recognized the existence of this duty. The said Court, viewing the evidence as on a demurrer to the evidence, found as a fact in this case that the defendant had discharged its statutory duty by turning over to the

plaintiff's intestate a locomotive engine and boiler with appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate. In these circumstances, the Court held that in order for the plaintiff's intestate to maintain an action for his death caused by the explosion of the boiler, the burden was upon the plaintiff to show that the explosion resulted from a defect in the boiler or its appurtenances as charged in the declaration. The said Court did not hold, and there is nothing in its opinion from which such a holding may be inferred, that the failure to furnish a boiler and appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate was not a violation of the duty of the carrier under the Federal Boiler Act.

The decision of the Court construing and applying the Federal Boiler Act to this case was clearly based upon the ground that the defendant had satisfied the requirements of the Act in turning over to the plaintiff's intestate an engine with boiler and appurtenances in proper condition and safe to operate. If the evidence had tended to show the existence of any defect in the boiler or its appurtenances, which caused the explosion, the Court would unquestionably have held the defendant guilty of a violation of its statutory duty, which of itself would have rendered the defendant guilty of negligence. The question here is not when and under what circumstances negligence will be inferred from a defect shown to exist in the boiler or its appurtenances of a locomotive engine, but when and under what circumstances a defect in the boiler or its appurtenances will be inferred from the fact that the boiler exploded. The plaintiff's contention is that under a proper construction of the Boiler Act, the mere fact of an explosion is sufficient for the inference to result that there was a defect in violation of the Act. As to whether or not this is the true interpretation of the Act does not arise in this case, because according to the uncontradicted evidence, including the inspections and reports of the engineer himself, the boiler and its appurtenances were in such condition as to

satisfy the requirements of the Act when the engineer took charge of the engine on the night of the explosion. The evidence shows, and it is a fact of common knowledge, that the most frequent cause for the failure of crown sheets in engines is low water, for which the engineer alone is responsible. This being true, it would be, to say the least, a harsh and unreasonable construction to place on the Boiler Act to say that the failure of a crown sheet was in itself evidence of a defect in the boiler and its appurtenances. The question as to whether or not such a construction of the Act would be proper, as already shown, does not arise in this case. The purpose and terms of the Boiler Act would not reasonably require such a construction. Section 2 of the Act is quoted on Page 4 of the plaintiff's brief, from which it appears that it is required that the boiler and its appurtenances must be sufficient to withstand certain prescribed tests. When the Act is read as a whole, it is obvious that it only requires the carrier to maintain the boiler and its appurtenances in a proper condition and safe to operate without unnecessary peril to life and limb. The Act expressly recognizes that there is at least some degree of peril connected with the operation of a locomotive engine and the carrier is only required to have the engine in such condition that it may be operated without unnecessary peril. Under any proper construction of the whole Act, it certainly could not be reasonably contended that if the carrier maintained its boiler and appliances up to the standard of efficiency prescribed by the Act, that then the mere fact of an explosion would cast upon the carrier an imputation of negligence and the burden of showing that the explosion resulted from causes other than a defect in the boiler or its appurtenances.

In cases arising under the Act, as well as in other negligence cases, in order for negligence to be inferred from the happening of an accident, there must be shown by the evidence such a condition of affairs that the accident, according to the ordinary experience of mankind, might

have been caused by the failure of the defendant to perform some legal duty. When the facts, as shown by the evidence, establish that the defendant has performed every duty imposed by the law, then no inference of negligence will result from the happening of an accident.

Ryan vs. Falls River Iron Works Co., 200 Mass. 188, 86 N. E. 310

Saxe vs. Walworth Mfg. Co., 191 Mass. 338; 77 N. E. 883.

The cases cited in the plaintiff's brief construing the Safety Appliance Acts are clearly not applicable in construing the Federal Boiler Act as applied to the facts of the instant case. The Safety Appliance Acts prescribe a definite and absolute standard for the particular appliances covered by the Acts.

In every case cited and relied on; the facts and circumstances in evidence were such as to show that the appliances failed to measure up to the prescribed standard. In other words, the mere happening of the accident was of itself a fact from which a reasonable inference resulted that the appliances at the time of the accident did not measure up to the standard prescribed by the Safety Appliance Act involved.

In the nature of things, as already shown, the failure of a crown sheet is not in itself evidence of a defect in the boiler or its appurtenances, and especially is this so when practically all such failures, as shown by the evidence in this case, are due to low water in the boiler.

II.

The Rule Applicable Under the Virginia Practice in Considering Evidence on a Demurrer to the Evidence.

The rule as stated on Page 48 of the plaintiff's brief for determining the effect of evidence when considered on

a demurrer to the evidence is correct. The qualification of the rule to the effect that in considering evidence upon a demurrer to the evidence the Court will not take detached statements of witnesses, but will consider the entire evidence of the witnesses, and will give a fair construction to the entire testimony of each witness is equally well established.

N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Holmes, 109 Va., 407.

This qualification of the rule is absolutely disregarded by counsel for plaintiff in their brief. In making reference to the evidence of witnesses they have in many instances picked out isolated statements of witnesses, which when read in connection with the entire evidence of the witnesses would convey an entirely different meaning from that intended to be conveyed by counsel in their brief.

It is equally well settled in Virginia that a demurrer to the evidence does not waive objections to illegal evidence.

N. & W. Ry. Co. vs. Warden, 117 Va., 801.

The rule is also absolutely disregarded by counsel for plaintiff in their brief. They refer to in support of their contentions and base most of their arguments on testimony which has been excluded or which is clearly improper under the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia.

III.

The Findings of Fact by the State Courts and the Effect of Such Findings Upon This Writ of Error.

The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, after reviewing the evidence, finds the facts as follows: "We are of the opinion that the body of the evidence, viewed from the standpoint of a demurrer to the evidence, shows that on the night of November 14, 1912, when the engine was turned over to the plaintiff's intestate, the boiler and its appurtenances were in proper condition and safe to operate

in the service to which the same were to be put in moving traffic without unnecessary peril to life and limb within the true intent and meaning of the Act of Congress. When the explosion occurred the locomotive engine and boiler and appurtenances were in the exclusive custody and control of the engineer, and were being operated by him. ..... Nor is this a case, as was pressed in argument, where the negligence of the engineer should go to mitigate damages, and not to bar the right of action. The evidence tends to show that the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate was the sole cause, not the contributing cause, of his death and, therefore, the rule invoked under the Employers' Liability Act has no application." (Record, Pages 582-583.)

This is a clear finding that the boiler was in proper condition and safe to operate, and the explosion was due to the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate in allowing the water in the boiler to become so low as to burn the crown sheet and cause the explosion. The case was remanded to the Circuit Court for a new trial. On the second trial, the Circuit Court excluded certain evidence which the Supreme Court of Appeals held was inadmissable. (Record, Pages 599-603.)

The evidence on the second trial, therefore, so far as it went, was identical with the evidence on the first trial, but did not include many of the speculative theories and conjectures of the witnesses as to what might or might not have caused the explosion.

The defendant demurred to this evidence, as submitted to the jury, which demurrer was sustained by the Circuit Court, and a judgment was entered thereon in favor of the defendant. There is nothing in the Record to indicate that the Judge of the Circuit Court regarded this evidence as sufficient to sustain a verdict adjudging that the explosion occurred from any defect in the boiler or its appurtenances. On the contrary, the Circuit Court, upon the demurrer to the evidence, entered an order stating that

"the evidence is not sufficient in law to maintain said issue on the part of the plaintiff," and thereupon sustained the defendant's demurrer, setting aside the verdict of the jury and dismissing the plaintiff's action. (Record, Pages 603-604.)

This is a solemn, judicial decision of the case by the Circuit Court, setting aside the verdict of the jury in favor of the plaintiff and entering judgment in favor of the defendant. There is nothing in the Record to indicate that the Judge of the Circuit Court entertained a private opinion as to the effect of this evidence differing from the judicial opinion entered of record as the judgment of the Court.

In theory, at least, the presumption is that when a Trial Court has been reversed by an Appellate Court, and thereafter enters judgment in the case in accordance with the decision of the Appellate Court that the Trial Court both privately and judicially acquiesces in the decision of the Appellate Court. However that may be, we are dealing here only with the judicial opinion and decision of the Circuit Court, that being the judgment under review in this case, and we are not concerned with what may have been the private opinion, not judicially expressed, of the Judge of said Court.

A petition for a writ of error to this judgment was presented to the Judges of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, in vacation, and was refused by them; and thereafter, the said petition was presented in open Court when the Court was in session and was refused by the Court. (Record, Page 606.) The refusal of this petition was based on the ground that the judgment of the Circuit Court sought to be reviewed was plainly right.

We, therefore, have this situation: The case was tried before a jury and resulted in a verdict on which the Trial Court entered a judgment. On a writ of error, the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia was of the opinion that the evidence did not sustain the verdict and remanded the

case to the Circuit Court for a new trial. The Supreme Court of Appeals expressed the opinion that some of the evidence admitted at the former trial had been improperly admitted.

On the second trial, the Circuit Court, on this revised record, held that the evidence was not sufficient to warrant a verdict for the plaintiff. This judgment was then reviewed by all of the five judges of the Supreme Court of Appeals, acting individually, in vacation, and by the Court in term, and the action of said Circuit Court was affirmed on the ground that it was plainly right.

The case presented by this record is, therefore, identical with *Baugham vs. N. Y. P. & N. R. R. Co.*, 241 U. S. 237; 60 L. Ed. 977, where the Court, after stating the respective contentions of the parties, said:

"A determination of these contentions depends upon the evidence, and, considering it, the said Courts, Trial and Appellate, decided against the contentions of the plaintiff, and in so doing in effect held that the conditions of the assumption of risk by deceased were satisfied. Gila Valley G. & N. R. Co. *vs.* Hall, 232 U. S., 94, 102; 58 L. Ed. 521, 524; 34 Sup. Ct. Rep., 229.

We have considered the evidence, and we cannot say that the conclusion was palpably erroneous, and following the rule expressed in Great Northern Ry. Co. *vs.* Knapp, 240 U. S. 464-466, and as having analogy, Chicago Junction Ry. Co. *vs.* King, 222 U. S. 222, we announce our concurrence without discussion."

The present case then is one which does not involve the interpretation of the Federal Boiler Act, or the definition of any legal principle in its application, but simply involves an appreciation of all the facts and admissible inferences in the particular case for the purpose of determining whether there was sufficient evidence to warrant submitting to the jury the question of whether or not the boiler was defective. The State Courts have held that

there was not sufficient evidence to go to the jury. This Court will not disturb the decision unless the error is palpable.

Great Northern Railway Co. vs. Knapp, 240 U. S. 464.

This Court will not disturb the decisions of the State Courts unless they committed manifest error.

Erie R. R. Co. vs. Welsh, 242 U. S. 303.

S. A. L. Ry. Co. vs. Koennecke, 239 U. S. 352.

The effect of these decisions is that the findings of fact by the State Courts will not be disturbed unless there is manifest, or palpable error, and the next inquiry is as to whether or not upon an examination of the evidence there is such error as will warrant a reversal of the judgment.

IV.

The Conclusions of the State Courts as to the Facts and Inferences Resulting Therefrom are not so Palpably Erroneous that this Court Will Base a Reversal of the Judgment on that Ground.

If it is conceded for the purpose of this argument that the Court should examine the evidence uninfluenced by the decisions of the State Courts, the evidence wholly fails to show, or even tend to show, a defect in the boiler or its appurtenances. On the other hand, the admitted facts and uncontradicted evidence in the case inevitably lead to the result that the explosion was caused by low water in the boiler, through the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate. It is an uncontroverted fact that the failure of the boiler was due to the giving away just beneath the crown sheet of the stay bolts which held the crown sheet in place. There was no question as to the sufficiency of the crown sheet itself. A number of the bolt heads which broke off and caused the crown sheet to fail were found in

the fire box after the explosion, and were offered in evidence. These bolt heads were broken down into the heads where they rested against the crown sheet, and the breaking occurred in the thickest and strongest part of the bolt heads. The plaintiff's contention in the Courts below was that the crown sheet gave way on account of some weakness in the bolts. The defendant's claim was that the bolt heads were weakened and caused to fail by being hot to such a degree as to weaken their strength, and were so heated on account of low water in the boiler.

It was an undisputed fact, testified by the plaintiff's experts, that the crown sheet offered in evidence had at some time prior to the failure been burned; that is heated with an absence of water on top of it. The specific question of fact to be determined is as to what caused the stay bolt heads to break; that is, was it on account of some weakness in the bolts themselves, which existed prior to the commencement of that trip, or was the crown sheet burned on that trip on account of low water in the boiler.

The plaintiff's case wholly depends upon the testimony of Jerry Walton, the fireman, and two so-called experts, Scrivenor and Randolph. This being so, it may be well to analyze the testimony of these witnesses and determine exactly what are the facts as testified to by them. The fireman, Jerry Walton, was a very pliable witness, and was willing, under the lead of counsel for the plaintiff, to testify to matters necessary to the plaintiff's case about which he had absolutely no knowledge, as his own testimony shows. The testimony of Jerry Walton, so far as it is involved here, only related to the water glass gauge and the injector. As to the water glass gauge, he testified that when they left Roanoke it was about half full; that he watched the water glass gauge on that trip; paid attention to it pretty much all the way until the train crossed the Norfolk & Western overhead bridge. (Record, Page 57-58.) That he did not look at the water glass gauge again until they were going by Singer tank; that the water was then a short

distance from the top of the glass; that he did not look at it again between that point, and the point where the explosion occurred. (Record, Page 58.)

In connection with what he said about the height of the water in the glass, it will be noted that his testimony was very indefinite. After measuring on his finger, the height of the water in the glass, he said, at the suggestion of counsel, that the water was something like one-half inch from the top (Record, Page 46) and when asked about it on cross-examination, he said he was uncertain about the water in the glass, and said he did not know whether on the former trial he said it was an inch from the top. (Record, Pages 60 and 61.) This witness does not claim to have observed the height of the water in the glass from the time the train crossed the Norfolk & Western overhead bridge until the train reached Singer tank, a distance of several miles, nor does he claim to have observed the height of the water in the glass from Singer tank to the point where the explosion occurred, a distance of about two and one-half miles. On the uncertain testimony of this witness, counsel for the plaintiff attempt to base a very accurate calculation as to the quantity of water in the boiler at the time the train passed Singer tank, when the witness claims to have last observed the water glass, to show that the water in the boiler, as indicated by the water glass, could not have been exhausted between that point and the point of explosion.

The difference of an inch or half an inch in the height of water in a water glass, under the varying conditions of operation, as shown by the Record, may have caused the crown sheet to have become uncovered. Moreover the plaintiff's calculations are based on the quantity of water that would be in the boiler above a point three inches below the top of the crown sheet. Obviously, the calculation is of no value because the crown sheet would begin to give way as soon as a portion of it became uncovered and softened from the heat, and, further, because we have no means of

telling how much of the water was below the top of the crown sheet.

In regard to the injector, this witness stated that the right injector was put in operation as the train passed out of the switch on the main line in the Roanoke yard (Record, Page 45); that this injector stayed on until the time of the explosion; that under ordinary conditions, such as the engine was working under on that trip, one injector will supply sufficient water for the boiler. (Record, Page 45.) He further says that the injector was forcing water in the boiler; that the water glass indicated that it was (Record, Page 45-46); that independent of the water glass, he could tell by the sound of the injector that the water was being forced into boiler. (Record, Pages 46-48.) His testimony in regard to the injector showed that this was his first trip on this engine (Record, Page 46); that he did not know where the injector on this type of engine was located, and he actually stated that the injector and pipe leading from it into the boiler were located inside of the cab, when, as a matter of fact, they are outside of the cab. (Record, Pages 61 and 63.) He did not know how many valves it was necessary for the engineer to use to put the injector into operation. In this connection, it may be noted that he was not familiar with this type of engine, and knew absolutely nothing about engines of this type. (Record, Pages 66 and 67.)

He repeated time and again the statement that he was not familiar with this type of engine, and this type of injector; that he was not familiar with that engine and never had anything to do with the operation of the injector. (Record, Pages 62 and 63.)

The Supreme Court of Appeals, after reviewing the evidence of this witness, held that his opinion evidence was plainly inadmissible, the effect of which was to reject the opinions expressed by him as to the operation of the injector.

The next witness on whom the plaintiff relies is Arthur Scrivenor, an alleged expert mechanical engineer, of wide

experience and study. It appears that this witness never saw the engine, crown sheet, broken bolts, or anything that would throw light on the cause of the happening of the accident until he appeared in court to testify as an expert for the plaintiff (Record, Page 112); that he had had absolutely no experience with crown sheets in locomotive engines that had failed on account of low water, or in any other engines for that matter; that he had had nothing whatever to do with locomotive engines since 1893 when he was a draftsman in the Richmond Locomotive Works; that he was unable to say whether he had ever in his life seen a crown sheet that had failed on account of low water. (Record, Page 87.) His opinion was that the crown sheet itself was not positive proof that it failed from low water, and when asked as to the cause of the failure, he said that in his opinion, it might have been caused from low water, or might have been caused from other things. (Record, Page 88.) This witness based his opinion entirely on the color of the crown sheet at the time of the trial, and stated that he could not say definitely how hot the sheet could have been to retain its present appearance, as he had no records of his own covering that point. He further said that if a burned crown sheet gets only a small quantity of oxygen, and a small quantity of air in contact with it, it may be blue, if very highly heated, and if it gets very much air in contact with it, it will be red. (Record, Page 92.) When asked on cross-examination if he could look at the sheet and tell whether or not it had been burned, he replied: "I have never seen a burned one just exactly that same color with water on top. That must be my reply, because I cannot say that I ever saw a sheet that I positively knew there was no water on top." (Record, Pages 91 and 92.)

The whole of the testimony of this witness is inadmissible under the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, and that Court very properly said that the conclusions expressed were matters of speculation and possessed no evidential value.

The plaintiff's other expert witness was a professor of mechanical engineering, who had not had any practical experience with locomotive boilers for a period of twenty-one years, and who came to testify in the case as an expert without having seen the engine, crown sheet, or the stay bolts, or anything that would throw light on the cause of failure. (Record, Pages 131 and 151.) It further appears that during his whole life he had never seen a single crown sheet that had failed from causes other than from low water (Record, Page 145); that during the past twenty years he had only seen three crown sheets that had failed from low water; one on the side of the railroad track, which he had observed from a passing train, another in a scrap pile at the Richmond Locomotive Works, and the other on the B. & O. Ry. fifteen or twenty years ago. (Record, Page 150.) He testified that he had examined the crown sheet in this case, and could see no indication of the absence of water at the time the crown sheet failed. (Record, Page 113.) He based this conclusion entirely upon the color and condition of the surface on the fire side of the sheet. (Record, Page 147.) He said that there was nothing else about the sheet except the color that would enable him to say that it went down with water on the sheet. (Record, Pages 147 and 148.) He admitted that the bagging between the stay bolts indicated that it had been burned or scorched at some time prior to the failure; that is, heated to a higher degree of temperature than it was ever intended to be heated. (Record, Pages 114-126.) He did not think that the appearance of the sheet indicated that it had been heated beyond a dark red (Record, Page 114); and says that the tensile strength of good stay bolt iron should not be injured sufficiently at that degree of temperature to cause failure (Record, Page 115); and, that in order for a failure to have been caused exclusively by low water, the heat must have been more intense than a bright red. (Record, Page 115.) He further says that while a crown sheet may be scorched or burned from having mud or oil on top of it, that the appearance of

this sheet indicated that it was more likely to have been scorched without water on top of it, and that the bags between the bolt holes show that the crown sheet was hot under pressure, and he thinks that the bagging was caused by being hot under pressure without water on top of it. (Record, Page 130.) This latter statement of the witness is in direct conflict with a previous statement to the effect that in his opinion the bags or bagging of the crown sheet between the stay bolts indicates that it was covered with water when it failed. (Record, Page 119.) When asked as to when this burning of the crown sheet occurred, he stated that it might have been three or four days, or it might have been as many seconds before the failure; that he could not tell; that if scorched a half hour before failure—certainly three-fourths of an hour before failure, and water had come back on the sheet, the conditions would be just as we find them. (Record, Pages 148 and 149.) This witness advanced various speculative theories as to how stay bolts may be weakened or injured, but as these opinions were purely speculative, they were clearly inadmissible.

The opinions of this witness, as to the cause of failure, the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia held were matters of speculation and possessed no evidential value. If his opinions can be said to establish anything as to the cause of failure, they only show that the crown sheet was scorched, or burned, at some time prior to the failure, and that this may have been done at any time from one-half hour prior to the failure to as much as three months prior thereto. As to the injector, the witness, Randolph, stated that he was familiar with the non-lifting type (Record, Page 117); that it is simple and has come into general use, and is a good injector (Record, Pages 117 and 118); that the only objection to this type of injector is that it is out of reach and difficult to hear; that he had trouble in operating them on dark and rainy nights, because it was difficult to tell whether it was working and putting water into the boiler. (Record, Page 118.) When the injector breaks with the waste pipe on the

outside a man could look out of the window and see if the injector is working or not, and that he doubts if he could hear the noise of escaping steam with the window closed. (Record, Page 118.) In regard to the water glass gauge, he testified that it would not have been possible for scale—if you mean by scale lime salts deposited from the water—to close up the gauge in an hour or so. (Record, Pages 118 and 119.) It clearly appears that he was limiting his testimony on that point to the deposit of lime salts and that he recognized the possibility of its becoming stopped up in some other way.

The first question of fact to be determined from the evidence is, as already shown, what caused the stay bolt heads to break. When the evidence is considered as on a demurrer to the evidence, certain facts are established by the testimony of the witnesses, both for the plaintiff and defendant, which show conclusively that the cause of the failure of the stay bolts was due to the burning of the crown sheet, through the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate at some time after the commencement of the trip on which the explosion occurred.

The following facts established by the evidence when viewed as on a demurrer to the evidence demonstrate that the accident occurred on account of the crown sheet having been burned, and that the burning of the crown sheet was caused by low water after the engine was delivered to the plaintiff's intestate.

(1) The appearance of the crown sheet indicated that it had been burned; that is, overheated at some time prior to the failure.

There were a number of witnesses, with large practical experience, who testified for the defendant that the crown sheet had unquestionably been burned, and that the explosion was caused by low water in the boiler at the time of failure.

The plaintiff's witness, Randolph, was of the opinion that the crown sheet was burned on account of low water in

the boiler. (Record, Page 129.) The appearance of the crown sheet, in the opinion of the plaintiff's other expert witness, Scrivenor, indicated that it may have failed from low water, or from other causes. (Record, Page 88.)

This evidence is conclusive to the effect that the crown sheet was burned at some time prior to the failure. The only difference of opinion between the witnesses for the plaintiff and defendant is as to when the burning occurred. In the opinion of the plaintiff's witness, Scrivenor, the burning may have occurred at the time of the failure, as the appearance of the sheet, in his opinion, indicated that it may have failed from low water, or from other causes. (Record, Page 88.)

In the opinion of the plaintiff's witness, Randolph, the absence of the red oxide color on the crown sheet indicated that the crown sheet had water on it at the time of the failure. (Record, Pages 113 and 114.) He bases this conclusion upon the color and condition of the surface of the fire box side of the sheet. (Record, Pages 147 and 148.) In his opinion this burning might have occurred at any time within from one-half hour prior to the failure, or three or four months prior to the failure. (Record, Pages 148 and 149.) The opinion of the witness, Randolph, that the burning of the crown sheet occurred at sometime prior to the failure, based entirely on the color of the sheet, is inconsistent with the theory of the witness, Scrivenor, that if a burned crown sheet gets only a small quantity of oxygen and a small quantity of air in contact with it, it may be blue as this sheet was, and if highly heated and gets very much air in contact with it, it may be red. (Record, Page 92.) This opinion of Randolph as to when the burning occurred is also contrary to conclusions which he admitted resulted from the existence of certain physical facts as will be hereinafter shown.

(2) The test to which the stay bolt material used in this engine was subjected shows that the material was free from all defects.

The design of the engine was such that the stay bolt material should stand a pressure of about sixteen times the pressure to which the stay bolts were subjected at the time of the failure. (Record, Page 322.) The material of which the stay bolts were made was subjected to the usual and customary tests before being used for making the stay bolts and under these tests proved to be satisfactory. (Record, Pages 166, 167, 172, 173, 177, 178, 179.) The material in some of the stay bolts which failed was tested after the explosion and found to be of sufficient tensile strength. (Record, Page 345.) When the engine was completed by the builders, and before it was delivered to the defendant, the boiler was subjected to water and steam tests under pressure greater than the steam pressure in the boiler at the time of failure, and satisfactorily withstood these tests. (Record, Pages 179, 208, 210.)

(3) The bagging of the crown sheet between the stay bolt holes on account of the crown sheet having been burned was such as to have caused leakage.

As a result of the explosion that portion of the crown sheet which failed was stretched and blow down for a distance of about ten inches below its normal position. (Record, Pages 340, 440.) The necessary effect of the crown sheet being blown down in this position was to have a tendency to reduce, or smooth out the bags between the stay bolt holes. (Record, Page 340.) After the failure, the bags between the stay bolt holes in that portion of the sheet which was blown down, were about one-eighth to three-sixteenths of an inch. (Record, Page 130.) The heads of the stay bolts which rested against the crown sheet were forced into a convex shape by the bagging of the sheet between the stay bolts prior to the failure. (Record, Pages 130, 340.) The shape of these stay bolt heads, which were found in the fire box after the explosion, as well as the bags between the stay bolt holes remaining in the crown sheet after it was blown down, show the extent to which the crown sheet was stretched by being overheated. The uncontradicted evi-

dence was to the effect that a crown sheet stretched to this extent by being burned at any time previous to the failure would have leaked. The plaintiff's witness, Randolph, says that the bagging between the stay bolt holes caused by the sheet being burned, would have caused leakage, unless something had been done to stop the leakage. (Record, Pages 145, 146.) There were a number of witnesses, all being men of practical experience, who testified for the defendant that the crown sheet was stretched by being burned to such an extent that the engine would have leaked so badly that it could not have been operated. (Record, Pages 414, 430.)

(4) The threads on the stay bolts which failed were not stripped, and the threads in the bolt holes in the crown sheet were not stripped.

Stay bolts have threads on them just above the bolt heads. These threads are screwed into the threads in the stay bolt holes of the crown sheet and the crown sheet rests against the stay bolt heads. These stay bolt heads must be so firmly screwed against the crown sheet, and the fit of the threads of the stay bolt in the threads in the hole of the crown sheet must be so perfect as to prevent leakage when the crown sheet is covered with water under a pressure of from 185 to 200 pounds to the square inch. The threads in the stay bolt holes of that portion of the crown sheet which was blown down, were so perfect after the explosion that the plaintiff's expert, Randolph, could only detect with a magnifying glass that the threads in a few of the holes had been bruised or forced out of their normal position. The uncontradicted evidence of the defendant's witnesses showed that the threads on the stay bolts which were screwed into the stay bolt holes had not been stripped by the explosion, and were in perfect condition That the threads on the stay bolts were in this condition, was conclusively demonstrated by the condition of the threads in the stay bolt holes in the crown sheet, because if the threads on the stay bolts had been stripped, the threads in the crown sheet would likewise have been stripped or battered to some extent, at least, and

would not have presented the perfect appearance that they did present after the explosion.

The fact that these threads were not stripped conclusively shows that at the time the crown sheet was blown down the crown sheet was soft and pliable from being overheated, and was stretched to such an extent before the bolt heads gave way that the threads on the stay bolts which were screwed in the crown sheet were entirely separated. This conclusively demonstrates that the crown sheet was over-heated on account of low water at the time of failure, as testified to by witnesses for the defendant. It also conclusively demonstrates that there would have been leakage to such an extent that the engine could not have operated, as testified to by the witnesses for the defendant, if the burning of the crown sheet had occurred at any time previous to the time of failure.

(5) The bagging of the crown sheet between the stay bolt holes was such that it could have been discovered by inspection.

The plaintiff's witness, Randolph, testified that the bagging of the crown sheet between the stay bolt holes on account of being burned was such that it could have been discovered by inspection, and that anybody with any experience whatever in the inspection of crown sheets would readily have discovered that this crown sheet had been burned. (Record, Pages 143 and 144.) This testimony of the plaintiff's witness was corroborated by the defendant's witnesses. (Record, Page 268.)

On the 11th of November, just three days prior to the date of explosion, this crown sheet was thoroughly inspected by an inspector of the defendant company, as required by the Federal Boiler Act, and was found to be in perfect condition. The engine from that time until the date of the explosion was alone operated by the plaintiff's intestate, and if he performed his duty, under the rules of the Company, he inspected the crown sheet at the commencement and end of each run. He was required to make written reports at

the end of each run showing the condition of his engine. The written reports made by him at the end of the last two runs were offered in evidence, and did not show that there was anything wrong with the crown sheet. The counsel for the plaintiff in their brief seek to draw an inference unfavorable to the defendant from the fact that the written reports for the last two runs only, were filed, and that the written report for the previous run was not produced and filed. It is gravely argued that from the failure to file this previous report that an inference may be drawn that there was some defect in the crown sheet reported. The utter lack of foundation for such an inference is the fact that the last two reports failed to show any defective condition of the crown sheet, because if a defective condition was reported at the end of the previous trip, and had not been repaired, it would have clearly been the duty of the plaintiff's intestate, under the rules, to continue to report this defective condition at the end of each trip, so long as such defect existed. When the plaintiff's intestate arrived at Roanoke on the morning of the 14th day of November, the date of the accident, if he performed his duty, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we must presume that he did, he inspected the crown sheet, and did not report that it was defective on account of being burned. The hostler who took charge of the engine on its arrival that morning also inspected the crown sheet and did not discover that it had been burned. (Record, Page 230.) The hostler who delivered the engine to Andrews on the evening of the 14th of November, when he started on the trip, during which the explosion occurred, inspected the crown sheet, and found that it had not been burned up to that time. (Record, Page 237.) After taking charge of the engine that even ng the plaintiff's intestate is shown to have performed his duty by making an inspection of the crown sheet before leaving Roanoke, and as he said nothing about the crown sheet having been burned, and started on the trip with the engine, we must presume that the crown sheet up to that time had not been burned.

There is absolutely no escape from the conclusion that the crown sheet of the engine had not been burned up to the time of the commencement of the trip on which the explosion occurred. As already stated, it is an admitted fact in the case that the crown sheet had been burned at some time prior to the explosion. The inevitable result, therefore, is that the crown sheet was burned at some time between the commencement of that trip and the happening of the accident.

(6) The way the bolt heads were broken down into the heads shows that the crown sheet and bolt heads were overheated, or burned, at the time of failure.

A number of bolt heads, as already stated, were found in the fire box of the engine after the explosion. These bolt heads were so broken that there were large concave cavities down in the heads. In other words, the bolt heads, in separating from the bolts, had not broken straight across where they rested against the crown sheet, but the breaks were irregular, the fracture of the material having occurred down in the heads. It is a fact of common knowledge and is shown by the uncontradicted evidence in the case that if the bolt heads had not been over-heated at the time of failure the fracture would have been straight across the bolts at the point where the heads rested against the crown sheet, and that the fracture would not have been irregular, extending down into the heads. The reason that the bolt heads broke in this way is due to the fact that when they became over-heated on account of low water, as explained by the witnesses, the material near the surface of the heads and nearest the fire became heated to the point of failure. The plaintiff's expert witness, Randolph, admits that the way the bolt heads were broken down into the heads and the color of the heads show that they were hot; that is, overheated from an absence of water on the crown sheet when they failed. (Record, Pages 532, 533 and 536.) This admission of the witness is in direct conflict with his statement to the effect that the color of the crown sheet indicates that

it had water on it at the time of failure. This admission, based on a physical fact which cannot be otherwise explained, must be more controlling than an opinion based alone on the color of the sheet, which may vary according to conditions—as shown by the testimony of the witness, Scrivenor. The color of a burned crown sheet will change as a result of lapse of time, and other conditions as shown by the testimony introduced by the defendant. (Record, Page 393.)

(7) The contour of that portion of the surface of the bolt heads resting against the crown sheet and the impression made on the crown sheet around the bolt holes showed that the burning of the crown sheet occurred at the time of failure.

The convex appearance of that portion of the bolt heads resting against and supporting the crown sheet which were found in the fire box after the explosion has already been described. The crown sheet around the bolt holes where the bolt heads rested against and supported the crown sheet showed distinct impressions which the bolt heads had made on the crown sheet in their tendency to pull through the sheet. The defendant's witnesses testified that the bolt heads could not have been forced in this shape, and that these impressions could not have been made by the bolt heads on the crown sheet unless the failure was caused by the crown sheet being burned. In other words, that if the failure had been caused from a weak or defective condition of the stay bolts, and the failure had occurred when the crown sheet and stay bolt heads were cold that the stay bolt heads could not have been forced in this shape, and that these impressions could not have been made by the stay bolt heads on the crown sheet. The plaintiff's witness, Randolph, says that when the stay bolts are in good condition and they are subjected to a sufficient strain to break them that this leaves a characteristic appearance on the crown sheet as a result, which appearance he found present on this crown sheet. (Record, Pages 125 and 126.) This shows that the stay bolts were of sufficient strength, and

that they could have only been broken in the way that they were by being over-heated at the time of failure.

As opposed to all of these unanswerable reasons that the crown sheet failed from being over-heated at the time of failure, we have only the theory of the plaintiff's witness, Randolph, that the color of the crown sheet indicates that it had water on it at the time of failure. The color of the crown sheet, as already shown, is an indication of uncertain value, and may vary according to conditions. In addition to this, the testimony of a number of witnesses of practical experience introduced by the defendant was to the effect that the color of the crown sheet, introduced in evidence, indicated beyond question that the crown sheet had been burned at the time of failure. However this may be, the foregoing facts which are established by the testimony of the witnesses for both the plaintiff and defendant show that the burning of the crown sheet necessarily occurred on that trip.

The inspections of the crown sheets, already referred to in detail, and the failure to discover either the bagging between the stay bolt holes or the leakage which would have been caused by the bagging, demonstrate that the crown sheet was not in that condition when the plaintiff's intestate took charge of the engine at the commencement of that trip. If the crown sheet was burned on that trip, it only remains to determine as to whether or not the defendant can be held responsible for the accident on account of a defective condition of the water glass gauge. The plaintiff seeks to establish a defective condition of the water glass gauge by the testimony of Jerry Walton that he observed the water in the water glass gauge, and that the right injector was supplying water to the boiler. His testimony may be said to establish, when viewed as on a demurrer to the evidence, that the water glass gauge showed water in the boiler when the train left Roanoke, and from that point to the Norfolk & Western bridge. It also indicated water in the boiler at Singer tank. He did not observe the water glass gauge from the Norfolk &

Western bridge to Singer tank, a distance of several miles, but not shown accurately by the record, and between Singer tank and the point of accident, about two and one-half miles. The testimony shows that if the injector was not properly working that the quantity of water in the boiler at Singer tank, as testified to by Jerry Walton, might be exhausted and the crown sheet uncovered at a point a considerable distance east of the point where the explosion occurred. (Record, Pages 277, 290.) The opinion evidence of this witness as to the operation of the injector and as to whether or not it was supplying water to the boiler was rejected by the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, and properly so in view of his admitted unfamiliarity with engines and injectors of this class.

The plaintiff's witness, Richardson, testified that a person had to be familiar with this type of engine and injector to be able to tell from the sound that the injector was working properly (Record, Page 75), and the effect of the testimony of the plaintiff's witness, Randolph, is that with the window closed it is difficult to tell whether the injector is working properly or not. (Record, Page 118.) The window was closed on this trip at the time of the accident. (Record, Page 261.) That there was no defect in the injector was conclusively shown by the evidence, and was an admitted fact in the case.

There is absolutely no evidence tending to show that the water glass gauge was defective or failed to properly register the water in the boiler except the testimony of Jerry Walton before referred to. The water glass gauge was in proper condition when the engine arrived in Roanoke on the morning of the accident, as shown by the written report of the plaintiff's intestate, and by the testimony of the hostler to whom he delivered the engine upon arrival. (Record, Pages 227, 228 and 229.) It was in a proper condition when the engine was delivered to the plaintiff's intestate at the commencement of the run on which the explosion occurred, as shown by the testimony of the hostler who delivered the

engine to the plaintiff's intestate. (Record, Page 236.) It must be presumed that the plaintiff's intestate performed his duty by inspecting the water glass gauge before starting on the run and found it to be in satisfactory condition; otherwise, he would not have relied on it. After the accident, the water glass gauge was inspected by two inspectors sent out by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as by a number of other people, and found to be in a perfect condition. (Record, Pages 415, 430.) These inspections demonstrate that there was no defect in the water glass gauge. This engine, as well as all other locomotive engines, was provided with gauge cocks for the purpose of determining the quantity of water in the boiler. The uncontradicted testimony of several witnesses is to the effect that the gauge cocks afford a more certain and reliable means of determining the quantity of water in the boiler than the water glass gauge. (Record, Pages 274, 291, 292.) It is also shown by the evidence not controverted that the movement of the water in the water glass gauge shows whether or not the water glass gauge is properly performing its function; that if the water glass gets stopped up, the sluggish movement of the water in the water glass gauge will show that it is not properly performing its function. (Record, Pages 274, 292.) If the water glass gauge is not working properly the engineer would know it. (Record, Pages 274, 292.) When the engineer finds that his water glass gauge is not working properly he can blow it out, or rely on the gauge cocks to indicate the quantity of water in the boiler (Record, Pages 274, 292). It is a fair inference from the testimony (Record, Pages 274, 292), that the openings leading into the water glass gauge may and do sometimes become stopped up while an engine is being operated. It is a fact of common knowledge that the water used in locomotive boilers is not free from sediment and other foreign matter, which may at any time stop up the openings to a water glass gauge. If the water glass gauge became stopped up on the trip on which the explosion occurred, it was the duty of the plaintiff's intestate to know that fact

and remove the obstruction or rely on the gauge cocks. If the water glass gauge was working properly at the commencement of the trip as demonstrated by the uncontradicted evidence above referred to, and the plaintiff's intestate allowed it to become stopped up, and relied on it in that condition, then his negligence was solely responsible for the accident, and there can be no recovery in this case.

After the explosion and as soon as it could possibly be done, the engine and boiler were carefully inspected by two boiler inspectors of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the exercise of their official duty for the purpose of making a report to the Commission, and was also inspected by the Chief Boiler Maker of the N. & W. Ry. Co., a disinterested party. (Record, Page 335.) The boiler was not only inspected by these disinterested parties, but the appurtenances thereto, such as water glass gauge, the injectors, the steam gauge, etc., were subjected to tests to determine their condition. These inspections and tests were made while the evidences of the cause of the explosion were fresh, and while the persons making the inspections had before them the entire boiler and its appurtenances and the effects of the explosion on the different parts of the boiler could then be observed in relation to each other. The plaintiff's witnesses never saw the entire boiler; in fact, the witness, Randolph (Record, Page 114), admits to the jury that he had not before him sufficient evidence to check his opinion. This witness did not see the portion of the crown sheet that was cut away from the rest of the boiler and brought into court until the first trial of the case in the Federal Court at Roanoke. (Record, Pages 127 and 151.)

The plaintiff's witness, Scrivenor, did not see any part of the exploded boiler until he testified in the case at Christiansburg on October 6th, 1914, nearly two years after the accident. (Record, Page 112.) Furthermore, the witnesses who examined the boiler immediately after the accident were, as already shown, practical men accustomed to dealing with such matters in their everyday work, and examined it

for the purpose of ascertaining what the real cause of the explosion was, and were, consequently, without prejudice. On the other hand, one of the plaintiff's witnesses had been without any practical experience for a period of twenty-one years and the other had had no practical experience, and the examinations they made were for the purpose of giving expert testimony on behalf of the plaintiff. The result of these impartial examinations made directly after the accident was that all of these experienced men were of the opinion that the explosion was undoubtedly caused by low water in the boiler at the time of the explosion. (Record, Page 413, 428 and 440.)

From this review of the evidence, it is clear that the breaking of the stay bolts which caused the accident was not due to any defect which existed at the time the plaintiff's intestate took charge of the engine, and that the explosion was caused by the stay bolts being over-heated and weakened through the negligence of the plaintiff's intestate at some time after the commencement of that trip. It is also clear that there was no defect in the water glass gauge at the commencement of this trip, and that if it became stopped up or out of order on this trip, it was the duty of the plaintiff's intestate to know that it was out of order and correct the trouble, or else not rely on it.

CONCLUSION.

It is, therefore, respectfully maintained that upon an examination of the evidence in this case, there is not only a failure to disclose that the findings of fact by the State Courts is palpably erroneous, but, on the contrary, such an examination of the evidence demonstrates that the facts and inferences resulting therefrom, as found by the State

Courts, are fully supported, and we might say fully demonstrated by the evidence.

E. W. KNIGHT,
H. T. HALL,
W. H. T. LOYALL,
G. A. WINGFIELD.
Counsel for Defendant in Error.

ANDREWS, ADMINISTRATRIX OF ANDREWS, *v.* VIRGINIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

ERROR TO THE ROANOKE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

No. 82. Argued December 16, 17, 1918.—Decided January 7, 1919.

A judgment of the Circuit Court of Virginia is not final for the purpose of review in this court while reviewable at discretion by the Court of Appeals of the State.

Therefore, a case by its nature reviewable here only by certiorari under the Act of September 6, 1916, c. 448, 39 Stat. 726, in which the Virginia Court of Appeals did not finally deny a writ of error

until November 13, 1916, cannot be brought here by writ of error, although the judgment of the Circuit Court preceded the act and the act excepts judgments rendered before it became operative, *i. e.*, 30 days from its date.

Writ of error dismissed.

To recover for the wrongful death of Andrews, a locomotive engineer in the employ of the defendant in error, the plaintiff in error, the representative of his estate, commenced this suit in April, 1914. Both the Employers' Liability Act and the act of Congress providing for the inspection of boilers of locomotives were alleged. Act of April 22, 1908, c. 149, 35 Stat. 65; Act of February 17, 1911, c. 103, 36 Stat. 913. On October 12, 1914, there was a judgment on a verdict in favor of the plaintiff. A writ of error having been allowed by the Court of Appeals of Virginia, the judgment was, on January 13, 1916, reversed and the case remanded for a new trial. *Virginian Ry. Co.* v. *Andrews' Admx.*, 118 Virginia, 482. The Circuit Court of Montgomery County, in which the case was tried, thereupon, by consent of the parties, transmitted it for trial to the Circuit Court of Roanoke County, in which court, on the 16th day of June, 1916, there was judgment in favor of the defendant. Thereupon a petition for writ of error to review this judgment was separately and out of term presented to the judges of the Court of Appeals and was denied, and on the opening of the term was, in accordance with the Virginia law, presented to the court, and was there finally denied on November 13, 1916. Then, on the 27th of November, 1916, a petition was presented to the presiding judge of the Circuit Court of Roanoke County for the allowance of a writ of error from this court, to review the judgment of that court of June 16, 1916, which was allowed, resulting in the case which is before us.

Mr. A. P. Staples and *Mr. A. B. Hunt* for plaintiff in error.

Mr. H. T. Hall and *Mr. G. A. Wingfield*, with whom *Mr. E. W. Knight* and *Mr. W. H. T. Loyall* were on the brief, for defendant in error.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WHITE, after making the foregoing statement of the case, delivered the opinion of the court.

At the threshold, there arises a question of our jurisdiction which we may not overlook and which we must therefore decide. The question is, has this court power by writ of error to review the judgment below; or, in other words, is the authority of the court to review that judgment confined by the Act of September 6, 1916, c. 448, 39 Stat. 726, to the right to do so by certiorari in the mode and time provided by that act? Considering the subject only from the character of the controversy, it is indisputable that the case comes within the generic class as to which the power to review by writ of error was taken away by the Act of 1916 and the authority to certiorari substituted. It results that, unless the judgment in question comes under some limitation or exception provided by the statute to the general rule which it establishes, we have no jurisdiction.

There is no room for such exception unless it results from the provision in the statute taking out of the reach of its terms judgments rendered before it became operative. The act was approved on September 6, 1916, and was made operative thirty days thereafter. In form, the judgment to which the writ of error was addressed was rendered on June 16, 1916, before the operation of the statute, and was therefore outside of its provisions. But the question remains, Was the judgment a final judgment at the date named, or did it become so only by the exercise by the Court of Appeals of its power as manifested by its declining to take jurisdiction on November 13, 1916,

after the passage of the act. Undoubtedly, before the action of the Court of Appeals, the judgment was not final and was susceptible of being reviewed and reversed by that court. Undoubtedly, also, until the Court of Appeals acted, the trial court was not the court of last resort of the State whose action could be here reviewed. The contention, therefore, that the judgment of the trial court was a final judgment susceptible of being here reviewed by writ of error must rest upon the impossible assumption that the finality of that judgment existed before the happening of the cause by which alone finality could be attributed to it.

It is true that under the law of Virginia, in a case like this the power of the Court of Appeals to review the judgment of the trial court was gracious or discretionary, and not imperative or obligatory; but the existence of the power, and not the considerations moving to its exercise, is the criterion by which to determine whether the judgment of the trial court was final at the time of its apparent date, or became so only from the date of the happening of the condition—the action of the Court of Appeals—which gave to that judgment its only possible character of finality for the purpose of review in this court. Nor is the result thus stated a technical one, since it rests upon the broadest considerations inhering in the very nature of our constitutional system of government, and material, therefore, to the exercise by this court of its rightful authority. That this is true, would seem to be demonstrated by considering that if it were not so a judgment of a state court susceptible of being reviewed by this court would, notwithstanding that duty, be open at the same time to the power of a state court to review and reverse, thus, in substance, depriving each court of its power and begetting the possibility of conflict and confusion.

From this it follows that the judgment to which the writ of error was addressed was in substance a judgment

rendered after the going into effect of the Act of 1916, and was only reviewable by certiorari, as provided in that act. The writ of error, therefore, must be and it is

Dismissed for want of jurisdiction.